REFLECTIONS

ON

Originality in Authors:

Being REMARKS on

A LETTER to Mr. MASON

ON THE

MARKS of IMITATION:

In which the abſurd Defects of that Performance are pointed out; and the abſolute uncertainty of Imitation in general is demonſtrated in various Inſtances:

WITH A WORD OR TWO ON

The Characters of BEN. JOHNSON and POPE.

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, S. PAUL, 1 Theſſ. 5.

Δυνατὸν εἶναι τα αυτα νοηματα εις διάφορους ἔρχεσθαι αυτοφυῶς.

EUSTATHIUS ad Hom. Il. ω.

LONDON:

Printed for R. HORSFIELD, Ludgate-Street, 1766.

[Price One Shilling.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE following Reflections were drawn up ſoon after the Letter, to which they owe their Origin, was publiſhed. Various Cauſes have concurred to prevent their earlier Appearance, with which it is no ways material to acquaint the Publick. If they ſhall now be found to be of Service to the Cauſe of Truth, and to the Eſtabliſhment of it upon the ſolid Baſis of Fact and Certainty, by removing dogmatical poſitive Error, with its hardy *Lord-Peter*-like Aſſertions on one Hand, and idle, vague, unſupported Conjectures on

the other, the Writer's Aim will in a great Meaſure be anſwered. He is not inſenſible that he has many Prejudices to encounter, in daring to think differently from one, who in almoſt every Thing his Pen has produced, has had the Voice of the monthly Critics loud in his Favour. If for what is here advanced in Contradiction to the Letter-writer, ſufficient Proof, and proper Evidence be produced, a candid Reception may at leaſt be expected. There are Perſons, who think they may ſay any Thing without Control, and expect an implicit Belief from whatever they urge without Contradiction. Men of this Stamp naturally preclude all rational Enquiry, for this of courſe expoſes their weak Side. There is, however, a Repugnancy in human Nature againſt tamely receiving what is thus forced upon us; and to ſuch a Relater,

a Relater, let his Station in Life be ever ſo great, may be appropriated this Line of *Perſius*,

Scire tuum nihil eſt, niſi te ſcire hoc, ſciat alter.

How ſuitable this may be to the Work here examined, muſt be left to the Reader to determine: Much will be found to be there aſſerted without any Kind of Foundation, as will appear in the Peruſal of the following Pages. From the apparent Futility of thoſe Marks of Imitation, and the no Evidence of it from them, where we have had the Clue of Hiſtorick Truth to guide us, may be juſtly inferred the Inanity of the reſt which are conjectural, and hypothetical only.

17 JY 60

Lately PUBLISHED,

Price Two Shillings and Sixpence Bound.

MISCELLANEOUS

PIECES

OF

Antient ENGLISH POESIE,

VIZ.

The Troubleſume Reign of KING JOHN.

Written by SHAKESPEARE,

Extant in no Edition of his Writings.

The Metamorphoſis of PIGMALION's Image, and certain Satyres.

By JOHN MARSTON.

The SCOURGE of VILLANIE. By the ſame.

All printed before the Year 1600.

London: Printed for R. HORSFIELD, Ludgate-Street.

Lately PUBLISHED.

Handſomely printed in Quarto, Price 10s. 6d. ſewed in Boards, the Firſt Volume, dedicated (by Permiſſion) to his Moſt Serene Highneſs the Hereditary Prince of Brunſwick, illuſtrated with a Map of the Seat of War, and Plans of the Battles of Lowoſitz, Prague, Kollin, Roſbach, Breſlaw, Liſſa, and Groſs-Jagerſdorff,

THE Hiſtory of the late War in Germany; between the King of Pruſſia, and the Empreſs of Germany and her Allies. Containing, 1. Reflections on the General Principles of War; and on the Compoſition and Characters of the different Armies in Europe. 2. An Explanation of the Cauſes of the War. 3. A Military Deſcription of the Seat of War; wherein all the important Fortreſſes, Poſitions, Camps, Rivers, Roads, Defiles, &c. are indicated. 4. The Operations of the Campaigns of 1756 and 1757: With Reflections on the moſt conſiderable Tranſactions: From whence the Principles of War are deduced and explained; and the Reaſons, which moſt immediately contributed to the Deciſion of them, given.

By a GENERAL OFFICER,

Who ſerved ſeveral Campaigns in the Auſtrian Army.

London: Printed for R. HORSFIELD, Ludgate-Street.

Lately PUBLISHED,

Price One Shilling and Sixpence Bound.

A N

EXPLANATION

OF THE

Accidence and Grammar

To the End of the

SYNTAX.

IN WHICH

The Grounds of each Rule in the Syntax are laid down in the plaineſt Manner.

Compiled by way of Queſtion and Anſwer,

For the Uſe of SCHOOLS.

By the Reverend THOMAS MARTIN, A. B.
Maſter of the GRAMMAR SCHOOL in Warminſter, Wilts.

London: Printed for R. HORSFIELD, Ludgate-Street.

17 JY 30

REFLECTIONS ON Originality in AUTHORS.

THERE is nothing cauſes a greater diſſenſion of opinion among men, than the affair of reſemblance in general. Two objects to one may appear as ſimilar as an egg to an egg: to another their ſameneſs be hardly perceptible. This however can no ways affect general Ideas, ſuch for inſtance in which all agree: but how far it may reach to particulars, it may be worth enquiring. That there is ſomething original in the vaſt volume of the univerſe is what every one muſt allow: all Deſcriptions then which are immediately formed from any objects which preſent themſelves in it, though they ſhould coincide with others made before, muſt neceſſarily be original though ſimilar, becauſe the object from whence they are formed is the ſame. This rule ſeems univerſally to hold good; but in all caſes where Imitation is expreſsly intended, or the Plagianiſm is ſo notorious as to admit no doubt of its reality. What led the way to this chain of think-

ing was the perusal of the *Discourse on Poetical Imitation*, and the *Letter to Mr. Mason* on the Marks *of it*. The former of these seems to have been written with a design to explode the notion of taking all Resemblances for Imitations, and in defence of the Originality of Authors. Thus speaking of the resemblance of the Elysiums, Arcadias, and Edens of antient and modern fame to the Tempe of the antients which had a real existence; he asks (1), how from any similarity in the materials, of which they are formed, shall we infer an *imitation?* "Common "sense, says he, directs us for the most part to "regard *resemblances* in great writers, not as the pil-"ferings or frugal acquisitions of needy *art*; but "as the honest fruits of genius, the free and libe-"ral bounties of unenvying nature." He goes a step farther and observes, "that great readers who have "their memories frought with the stores of ancient "and modern poetry, unavoidably employ the sen-"timents, and sometimes the very words, of other "writers, without any distinct remembrance of them, "or so much as the suspicion of having seen them." This argument is pursued in the Letter, p. 6. where it is asserted, "That writings will in many "respects be similar, where there is no thought or "design of *Imitating*." These are truths which demand a general assent. But though he has judiciously illustrated them in the discourse and beginning of the letter, we shall find by and by that he changes his opinion: and upon perusing of his

(1) Discourse of Poetical Imit. 2d Ed. Pages 126. 150. 213.

"Marks

Marks, ſhall ſee openly contradicts them. But before we proceed to the examination of theſe, it may be proper to canvaſs a paſſage or two as we go along. "The Greek writers, ſays he, p. 7. "were, or for any thing we can ſay *might* be ori-"ginals. But we can rarely affirm this of any other. "Rome adorned itſelf in the ſpoils of Greece: and "both aſſiſted in dreſſing up the later European Po-"etry. What elſe do you find in the Italian or French "wits but the old matter worked over again"? Who are we to underſtand by *the Italian or French wits?* Are they the Poets? If ſo, the naming theſe together muſt be an affront to the former. For has France any Poet that may be named with the illuſtrious *Dante*, or that *Milton* of the Italians the great *Taſſo*? It muſt be allowed on all hands ſhe has not (2). Every one that is acquainted with the Italian Poets muſt know (and that has always been objected to them as their fault) that their ſubject matter is entirely the reverſe of any thing to be met with in the ancients, conſequently there muſt be ſomewhat beſide the *old matter worked over again* (3). This

 peremp-

(2) Monſieur *Menage* allows that the French and Spaniſh Languages are inferior to the Italian, conſidered with a view to the number of their writers.---Che le cedono per lo numero de vaghi & ingegnoſi Componitori. Meſcolanze, Ed. Ven. 1736. p. 72.

(3) In Confirmation of what is here urged, let me add the teſtimony of the learned *Scipio Maffei* in his *Prefazione* to the *Italia Liberata* of *Triſſino*, of which he is ſpeaking. Poemi narrativi, ſays he, avea per verita avuti anche ne due ſecoli precedenti la noſtra lingua, ma di *nuova ſpecie, & d' altre maniere*, non degne forſe di' minor lode, *ma diverſe dalla norma de gli Antichi.*

peremptory declaration in favour of the antients and denying the moderns any merit at all in point of Invention, is partially to confine ſenſe and genius to the Former only, while many of the Latter have given the greateſt proofs of their being poſſeſſed of both theſe qualities in the higheſt degree. In this, however, he confirms at length what he before briefly aſſerted (4) that "all is derived, all is "unoriginal." But ſurely that Poet may be ſaid to be an original, let him live at any period of Time; who though he ſhould ſometimes ſubmit to imitation, yet forms his deſcriptions and language, and executes his plan from his own obſervation, and does not derive it from the ſtorehouſe of others labours.

I obſerved before that the Letter in ſome places contradicts the diſcourſe. This may be inferred from what we read p. 9. "The drift of all this, "you will ſay, is to overturn the former diſcourſe; "for, in my opinion, every degree of likeneſs is ex- "poſed to the *ſuſpicion* of Imitation. To convert "this ſuſpicion into proof, it is not enough to ſay "that a writer *might*, but that his circumſtances make "it plain or probable at leaſt that he *did* imitate." Theſe Circumſtances the Author reduces to three, Age, Education, and Character. And on theſe he lays great ſtreſs: but admitting as much as could be deſired in this caſe, nothing would be proved,

chi. To this let me ſubjoin the corroborating Evidence of *Becelli* in his Treatiſe on the Italian Poetry: He is ſpeaking of the Poemi Romanzi, —— a noi non di pentimento; ma di gloria e l'averli dalle greche & latine poeſie diſtinti. l. 2. p. 106.

(4) Diſc. p. 1.

all

all would be ſtill Hypothetical and uncertain only. But ſuch ſeems to be the ſtate of the modern Critick. Brilliancy of fancy without a low condeſcenſion to truth is the principal ingredient requiſite to form that illuſtrious character. To aſſert facts roundly without ſtopping to examine into their reality or probability, whether in the Courſe of Time they could or could not happen, this with him is a moſt conſtant practice. Were there any proſpect of amending this ſet of men, one might have expected that an end ſhould have been long ſince been put to this, as it is moſt rationally attacked by the celebrated Pen of Dr. Parnel. "It muſt be granted, ſays he, "this manner of *proving by affirmation* is of an ex- "traordinary nature; but however it has its end "with a ſet of readers, for whom it is adapted. "One part of the world knows not with what aſſu- "rance another part can expreſs itſelf. They imagine "a reaſonable creature will not have the face to ſay "any thing which has not ſome ſhadow of reaſon to "ſupport it; and run implicitly into the ſnare which "is laid for good-nature by theſe daring Authors of "Definitive Sentences upon bare aſſertion (2)."

From this digreſſion come we now to the ſubject Matter of his book. His firſt mark of Imitation is as follows: "An Identity of the *ſubject matter* of "Poetry is no ſure evidence of Imitation: and leaſt "of all perhaps in natural deſcription." This we may obſerve is of the negative kind; and certainly it is eaſier to ſay what is not Imitation than to prove what it really is. For paſſages may be ſtrikingly

(2) The Remarks of Zoilus, B. i. v. 1.

ſimilar where there is no probability of an Imitation. There are many ſentiments that neceſſarily obtrude themſelves on Poets deſcribing the ſame ſubject: and we know without the authority of *Euſtathius* the poſſibility of the ſame ſentiments occurring to different perſons. To illuſtrate this fact: *Spenſer* ſpeaking of the Ship, ſays it

Had—arms and *wings*, and head and tail (3).

Taſſo attributes to ſhips the very ſame particular of *Wings*.

E le navi volar com' habbian *penne* (4).

Here is in both the very particular circumſtance of the wings; and that both are originals, at leaſt that the one is not borrowed from the other is evident from the Date of their reſpective works (5). This will alſo ſerve to ſhew that the ſame uncommon ſentiment in different writers is not always the effect of imitation. To proceed with the reſt of this mark: "Yet where the *local* peculi-"arities of nature are to be deſcribed, there an "exact conformity of the matter will evince an Imitation." Let us put the caſe that two Poets deſcribe the local peculiarities of nature: Theſe,

(3) Colin Clouts come home again.

(4) Gier. conq. L. iii. 10.

(5) Spenſer's was wrote 1591. Taſſo's was not publiſhed till 98, and that he was ever acquainted with our Language his Biographers have not told us.

objects

objects being open to the obſervation of all men, in this Inſtance a Reſemblance is to be looked on as an Imitation in no other light, than as Poetry is a mimetick art, not as derived from another's work, unleſs there are ſtrong identical circumſtances to evince the borrowing, or ſhew the defect, or the ſuperiority of genius in the copier. But where Poets are of the ſame country, and have the ſame objects for deſcription, there a ſameneſs can hardly be admitted as a mark of Imitation. For inſtance, let us take that of the Spring: and that particular one of *Shakeſpear*'s *North-eaſt*, "that nips the blooming Infants of the Spring". Though he was one of *Milton*'s favorite Authors, yet ſurely it muſt be allowed poſſible for Milton to uſe theſe expreſſions without having had recourſe to, or (in the unmeaning phraſe of modern Criticiſm) *having his eye* on him. In Samſon Agoniſtes, v. 1576. Manoah ſpeaks of his hope of his Son's delivery, as

> Abortive as the firſt born bloom of Spring
> *Nipt* with the lagging rear of winter's Froſt

This paſſage carries ſuch ſtrong evidence of originality in itſelf, and particularly that part of it—*the lagging rear of winter's froſt*, that it were abſurd to aſcribe it to any other cauſe than that of the Poet's own obſervation. So before, in the Epitaph on the Marchioneſs of Wincheſter, he uſes the ſame ſimile.

> So have I ſeen ſome tender ſlip
> Sav'd with care from winter's *nip*.

Theſe

These general accidents of nature are equally obvious to the notice of all men; and without the surest mark of Imitation, which our author has taken no notice of at all, namely, Historical Evidence, it cannot be concluded with certainty, that the Junior Poet is indebted to the former for the Sentiment. I shall illustrate this by a negative mark of Originality. In Dr. Newton's Milton, under the Words Adamantine Chains, are inserted from *Æschylus* —Ἀδαμαντίναις πεδήσιν. The Phrase is doubtless the same in both: but does it therefore follow that the English Poet derived it from this Quarter? The possibility of the thing must be readily admitted; but where is the certainty of it? As we have no manner of proof that he had recourse to this writer for this particular sentiment, a thousand assertions that he had will amount to nothing. For as he might have found the same expression in various other writers, it is evident that there is no absolute certainty that he preferred this passage of *Æschylus* to what he found in *Spenser*, or *Johnson*, or the others. Hence then may we infer that it is no Impeachment of the Originality of an Author, that he sometimes has the same very remarkable Phrase, made use of by another whom he is known to have read: as for this passage of *Milton*, who can say it is not strictly his own? It is true he did not coin the words, but the sentiment occurred to him in common with various others: among whom were his Master *Spenser* (6), and

(6) Faerie Queene, B. ii. 6. 12. St. 82. Hymne of Love. St. 13.

Johnson

Johnson (7). This being the case, peculiar Phrases being as it were publick property — we may reasonably suppose that *Milton* might have wrote "clus-"tring locks" — without having his thoughts turned to the πλοχμοι βοτρυοεντες of *Apollonius*, and—"*curl* the grove in ringlets *quaint*," without servilely copying from *Johnson*'s — old Sherwood's head more quaintly curl'd. When therefore a particular mode of expression occurs in divers writers, there it is absolutely unsafe to pronounce an Imitation. This at least was the sentiment of the famous *Henry Stephens*, in his Observations on *Virgil*'s Imitations of *Theocritus*: from whose first Idyllium he cites Κούτοι τι φθονέω. And from *Virgil*—Non equidem Invideo, miror magis (8). On which, though the whole drift of his performance is to shew the borrowings of the Roman Poet from the Father of the Grecian Pastoral, he observes—Non necesse tamen est fortasse hic imitationem constituere; quamvis hæc verba Græca sonent non equidem invideo: *quoniam*, says he, *genus hoc loquendi & apud alios extat*. This manner of reasoning is certainly founded on Fact. For how can any one, who has the least regard to truth, affirm certainly, which passage (where it occurs in diverse) furnished the sentiment to the supposed borrower? To illustrate this by an instance or two: and they shall be from *Milton*'s Song on May Morning.

(7) Alchemist, Act iv. Sc. 1. Add to these Drayton, Polyolbion, Song 1. Phin. Fletcher, Purple Island, c. 12. St. 64. S. P. in a Poem, called Mundorum Explicatio, London, 1661. p. 146.

(8) Edit. Anno 1579. 12mo. ad Fin. Theocriti, &c. p. 25.

Now

Now the bright morning ſtar, day's harbinger,
Comes dancing from the Eaſt.

This paſſage, according to Mr. Warton (9), ſeems copied from Spenſer's Phœbus — came dauncing forth (1). But he rather thinks the Poet drew it from the Cuckow, a Poem, by Niccols, printed 1607, where is this line—

From whence the dayes bright King, came dauncing out.

He afterwards obſerves, that it is neceſſary in criticiſing on *Milton*, *Johnſon*, *Spenſer*, that an acquaintance with cotemporary writers ſhould be had. What ſhall we ſay then to this verſe of *G. Fletcher's*—

A Starre comes dauncing up the Orient (2)?

If from the ſtronger reſemblance we are to infer the Imitation, it is not to be doubted but this line muſt be admitted, as having moſt probably furniſhed the ſentiment: but this can be nothing but unſupported conjecture, as will appear more clearly by what follows: as *Milton* in the paſſage before us makes the morning ſtar a feminine — *and leads with her* — It may be ſurmiſed with equal certainty, that he alludes here to one of *Petrarch's* Sonnets, as that he has copied from any one of the authors abovementioned.

Gia fiammegiava l' amoroſa ſtella
Per l' *oriente*. Son. 26.

(9) Obſervations on Spenſer, p. 242.
(1) F. Q. 1. 5. 11.
(2) Chriſt's Victory, a Poem, Lond. 1610. 4to. c. 1. St. 82.

To

To proceed to another paſſage of this ſong:

The flow'ry *May* who from her green lap throws
The yellow cowſlip, and the pale primroſe.

Let us hear the different opinions upon this. And firſt Dr. Newton ſuppoſes this Image to be borrowed from *Shakeſpear*. Rd. II. Act 5.

——— who are the violets now
That ſtrow the *green lap* of the new come ſpring.

2dly, Mr. Warton quotes from the *Cuckow* abovementioned:

And from her fruitful lap each day ſhe threw
The choiceſt flowers.

To theſe may we add what *Spenſer* ſays of this month:

Then came fair May ———
Deckt all with dainties of her ſeaſons pryde,
And throwing flowers out of her lap around (2).

Which of theſe paſſages ſhall we ſuppoſe *Milton* imitated? Muſt we not rather in this place ſubſcribe to Stephens's opinion—quod quoniam genus hoc loquendi apud alios exſtat—ergo non neceſſe eſt hic imitationem conſtituere? The identical circumſtance in the ſeveral places before cited is that of the Lap: which is claſſical, and occurs in Virgil's lovely Deſcription of the Spring—Æther conjugis in grenium

(2) Faerie Queene, B. vii. c. 7. St. 34.

the

lætæ deſcendit (3), a Deſcription which, abſtracting the two circumſtances of the Stork's approach, and the Vines thruſting out its buds, will fit our Soil as well as *Italy*. In the concluſion of this firſt head our Author ſays—"I preſume then to give it for a "certain note of Imitation, when the properties of "one clime are given to another." Could we furniſh one inſtance to this ſage concluſion, any man of common ſenſe would place it not to the ſcore of Imitation, but downright abſurdity. Let us put the caſe that a writer deſcribing Engliſh Summers, ſhould attribute to them a continued ſeries of heats equal to thoſe of the *Andes*, or our winters, with ſuch long intenſe cold as rages in *Nova-Zembla*; (here the properties of one clime are given to another) would it not be moſt abſurd in theſe Inſtances to think of an Imitation? It would be a plain deviation from truth and fact. In ſuch caſes there can be no copy, becauſe there is hardly an original. Let this ſuffice for the firſt Mark. The *ſecond* is—"That it is a certain note of Imitation—when the "Genius of one people is given to another." And here he tells us—"*Plautus* gives us the following "TRUE Picture of the Greek manners.—

In hominum ætate multa eveniunt hujuſmodi—
* * * * * * * * * * * * *
Iræ interveniunt, redeunt rurſum in gratiam.
Verum Iræ ſiquæ forte eveniunt hujuſmodi,

(3) Georgica, l. 2. v. 325, 6. See alſo Æn. iii. v. 509. See alſo B. ii. c. 2. St. 6.

Inter

Inter eos rursum si reventum in gratiam est,
Bis tanto amici sunt inter se, quam prius (4).

It would surely puzzle the nicest Critic that ever was to find out any Manners at all in this very odd Quotation. What are the *Iræ hujusmodi?* For these are the only words that particularise any thing, if they may be said so to do. To get at the meaning of these, it is absolutely necessary to have recourse to the original, and upon perusal of that we find, that they are the effect of a reconcilement betwixt *Jupiter* in the person of *Amphitruo* and *Alcumena* upon the score of Jealousy: accordingly, in the beginning of this Scene she exclaims—

Durare nequeo in ædibus. Ita me *probri*
Stupri, *dedecoris* a viro argutam meo!

And that this is a true state of the case is evident from the quarrel which happened between her and the real *Amphitruo*, and occurs before, Act ii. Sc. 2. Where then are the Greek manners which we are told so peremptorily are painted in these lines? They are Greek in no other sense than they are the Manners of mankind in general (5); to which they as pro-

(4) Amphitr. Act iii. Sc. 2.

(5) This was wrote before any opportunity of consulting *Lambinus* offered: and he in his remarks on this passage, confirms what is here asserted, and says----Plautus non de amantibus tantum, verum de omnibus loquitur. What readers did the Letter-writer expect when he threw out such random assertions?

perly belong, as the line which ſhould be placed between the firſt and ſecond in this quotation:

Capiunt voluptates, capiunt rurſum miſerias.

Can any thing more ſtrongly deſcribe mankind than this? But if theſe lines deſcribe the Greeks only, or in other words are a true picture of manners peculiar to the Greeks, *Shakeſpear*, who has been ever hitherto ſuppoſed well acquainted with human nature, was guilty of a great error in making the reconcilement ſo ſtrong betwixt the Jealous Ford and his wife upon his diſcovery of her innocence. So much for this mark.

A third is obſervable in the repreſentation of certain tenets different from thoſe which prevail in a writer's country or time. The example to this will ſhew the truth of what we have before aſſerted, viz. that the Letter in certain parts of it is contradictory to the diſcourſe. *We are ſeldom*, ſays he, *able to faſten an imitation, with certainty, on Shakeſpear.* From him, however, he cites theſe verſes.

Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;
To lye in cold obſtruction, and to rot;
This ſenſible warm motion to become
A kneaded clod; and the delighted ſpirit
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reſide
In thrilling regions of thick ribb'd ice;
To be impriſon'd in the viewleſs winds,
And blown with reſtleſs violence about
The pendant world.—

Meaſure for *Meaſure*.

We ſee

We ſee in this paſſage, ſays he, *a mixture of Chriſtian and Pagan Ideas—ſuch as Shakeſpear had never dreamt of but for Virgil's Platonick hell*;

——— aliæ panduntur inanes
Suſpenſæ ad ventos: aliis ſub gurgite vaſto,
Infectum eluitur Scelus, aut exuritur igni.
Lib. 6.

If in this Inſtance the Letter-writer is to be credited, no heed is to be given to what is ſaid by the Author of the Diſcourſe; there we are told of the poſſibility "of confronting every ſentiment which in the Greek "Tragedians is made expreſſive of particular *charac-* "*ters*, with ſimilar paſſages in the various living pour- "traitures of *Shakeſpear*: Yet he, who after taking "this learned pains, ſhould chuſe to urge ſuch paral- "lels, when found for proofs of his *Imitation of the* "*Antients*," (we ſee he ſpeaks at large) "would only "run the hazard of being reputed by men of ſenſe, as "poor a critic of human nature as of his author (4)." I have been brief in my obſervations on theſe two MARKS, and ſhall be ſtill more ſo on thoſe which immediately follow. It were a needleſs waſte of time particularly to conſider every mark, as they are ſtiled of Imitation, becauſe ſo far from pointing out what is really Imitation, and what not, they are for the moſt part, inconcluſive, unconvincing, and in fact determine nothing in the matter. But farther: Theſe are paſt by not that they are unanſwerable, or contrariwiſe demonſtrative of what

(4) Diſcourſe, p. 140.

they aſſert, but that they ſeem to be of a piece with what comes next to be conſidered, and may be rather ſuppoſed to have been fitted to the examples, than that it is any ways probable the examples were originally the reſult of ſuch rules. Taking it for granted then that the marks are framed from the examples, not that thoſe rules were really uſed by the writers to whom they are aſcribed, the probability of which will, I think, hardly be queſtioned; I ſhall now proceed to the examination of the *eleventh mark*, which is as follows, and let the reader make as much as he can of it. *Writers*, ſays he, *are ſometimes, ſollicitous to conceal themſelves: at others they are fond to proclaim their Imitation. It is*, he adds, *when they have a mind to ſhew their dexterity in contending with a great original.* He then proceeds to this paſſage of *Milton:*

——— Wiſdom's ſelf
Oft ſeeks to ſweet retired ſolitude,
Where with her beſt nurſe, Contemplation,
She plumes her feathers, and lets grow her wings
That in the various buſtle of reſort
Were all too ruffled, and ſometimes impair'd.

Theſe are lines worthy the pen of a Seraph, and ſo every way compleat, that one would have thought they never could have been drawn into any odious compariſon. There is an infrequent uſe of the word in the firſt verb, but it is ſuch as occurs in the Son of *Sirach*, who ſpeaking of wiſdom ſays, They that *ſeek to* her early,

early, ſhall be filled with joy (5). Let us ſee what uſe the great Critic by profeſſion, and our Author who ſeems ſo ambitious of treading in his ſteps makes of them. And the firſt in the note here cited tells us, *Mr. Pope has imitated this, and (as was always his way when he imitated) improved it.* Here by the way, gentle reader, give us leave to expreſs our diſſent to what is in this place aſſerted, and to obſerve once for all that Mr. *Pope* never was poſſeſſed of Talents great enough to improve upon *Milton*. *Pope* often refers us in his notes to *Milton*, and ſometimes Plagiary-like conceals his obligations to this quarter; but that he any where *improves* upon him it behoveth his Flatterers and Defendants to demonſtrate; and to this end it would not be amiſs for them to bear in mind the good old Adage — *affirmantis, eſt probare:* but now let us haſten to this ſuppoſed Improvement:

Bear me, ſome Gods! oh, quickly bear me hence
To wholeſome ſolitude, the nurſe of Senſe;
Where Contemplation prunes her ruffled wings,
And the free Soul looks down to pity Kings.

We are told above that *Pope* has imitated this thought and improved it. And it is reaſonable that he ſhould have done ſo. For ſuch kind of borrowing as this (ſays *Milton*) (6), if it be not bettered by the borrower among good Authors is accounted plagiary. But our great critic goes a ſtep farther. *Mr. Pope, I ſay,* (αυτος εφη) *has not only improved the harmony but the ſenſe.* As much the one as the other:

(5) Eccleſ. iv. 12. (6) εικονοκλαστης, ὁ. xxiii.

would not the Annotator here insinuate that this passage of *Milton* is deficient in the sense? Else how has Mr. *Pope* improved it? He has not shewn wherein Mr. *Pope* has improved either the harmony or the sense; he has only said it, and how far he is to be credited in his assertion we shall see presently. He goes on to state the case, and tells us—*In Milton Contemplation is called the nurse* [sc. of Wisdom] *In Pope*, says he, *more properly Solitude* [sc. of Sense.] Do these words Sense and Wisdom convey the same Idea? But why is Solitude more properly the nurse? It must be so to be sure, because W. has asserted it: pity it is that we have no better reason. Sir *Philip Sidney* was of a different opinion when he stiled Solitariness the sly enemy that doth most separate a man from well doing. Mr. *Pope*, as he apparently copies from this passage of *Milton*, so he joins together Contemplation and Solitude. But let us wade through this heavy mass of unmeaning matter. *In Milton*, (says the Annotator) *wisdom is said to prune her wings*; in what part of Milton is she said to do this? It seems Milton must be misrepresented, that a stronger resemblance betwixt him and Pope may be effected; for says our Annotator — *In Pope Contemplation is said to do it*. *Pope* says Contemplation *prunes* her [own] ruffled wings: But *Milton* says no such thing of Wisdom, at least not in the place before us; of her he says,

She plumes her feathers, and lets grow her wings.

To assert there is any thing here like *pruning of wings* is a ridiculous hypercriticism: so that the Argumen-

Argumentation purſued in the remaining part of the note muſt go for nothing: this, however, we will examine as briefly as we may. Not to miſrepreſent him we ſhall tranſcribe the remainder of the note at large: In *Pope*, ſays he, "Contemplation "is ſaid to do it, and with much greater propriety, "as ſhe is of a *ſoaring* nature; and on that account "is called by *Milton* himſelf the Cherub Contem "plation."

If Wiſdom is from above (7), if Wiſdom cometh from the King of Heaven (8), ſhe too muſt be of a ſoaring nature. Conſequently then there can be nothing of this much greater Propriety in *Pope*. But the reaſon he has given why the Poet has made Contemplation a Cherub is ſtill more curious: it is on account of her ſoaring nature; had he had no better reaſon he might have made the high-touring Eagle ſuch, or any other of the—

Birds that ſinging up to heaven-gate aſcend.

He refers us here to a paſſage which he ſeems to have no notion of, and which likewiſe Dr. *Newton* and Mr. *Thyer* ſeem greatly to have miſtaken:

But firſt and chiefeſt with thee bring,
Him that you ſoars on golden wing,
Guiding the fiery-wheeled throne,
The Cherub Contemplation (9):

(7) St. James iii. 17. (8) 1 Eſdras iv. 58, 59. (9) Il Penſeroſo.

The

The whole of these lines, so far as they relate to the Cherub, allude to various passages in the tenth Chapter of the Prophet *Ezekiel*: there we read v. 1. above the head of the Cherubims, there appeared—the likeness of a Throne, v. 6. The Man cloathed with linen is commanded to take fire from between the wheels from between the Cherubims. But the verses which gave Life to the Poet's Muse were probably the sixteenth and nineteenth. "And "when the Cherubims went the wheels went by them: "and when the Cherubims lift up their wings, to "mount up from the earth, the same wheels also turned "not from beside them." And the Cherubims lift up their wings and mounted up from the earth in my sight. See also Chapter the first. Dr. *Newton* confesses he could not find out from whence *Milton* copied this Description: and observes this Figure of Contemplation is more like a Cupid than any thing else: had Scripture taken no notice of the wings of the Cherub, we might still have justified *Milton* by what we meet with in *Spenser* — who speaks of the bright Cherubims,

Which all with golden wings are over-dight (1).

This too is a favourite mode of expression with the Poet, and occurs in two other places in his works: In his Poem on the Death of a fair Infant, he addresses her (2).

Or wert thou of the golden-winged hoast,
Who having clad thyself in humane weed

(1) Hymn of heavenly Beauty. (2) St. 9.

To earth

To earth from thy prefixed ſeat didſt poaſt.

Again in the Maſque the Lady exclaims:

O welcome pure ey'd faith, white handed hope,
Thou hovering Angel girt with golden wings.

As this digreſſion aroſe from the ſubject before us the reader will be pleaſed to pardon it. To reſume then our former Diſcourſe. And here it were injuſtice to take no notice of Mr. *Thyer*'s ingenuous remark: there is ſomething, ſays that real judge, ſo vaſtly ſtriking and aſtoniſhing in theſe Lines, that it is impoſſible to paſs them over without ſtopping to admire and enjoy them. This muſt be the caſe with every man who has any taſt for fine ſentiments conveyed in clear and forcible expreſſion. This elaborate comment, which I have taken the pains to canvaſs and confute, preſents us with an inſtance of the truth of this Obſervation of Mr. *Addiſon*: (3) the moſt exquiſite words and fineſt ſtrokes of an author, ſays that polite writer, are thoſe which very often appear the moſt doubtful and exceptionable to a man who wants a reliſh for polite learning; and they are theſe which a ſour undiſtinguiſhing Critick generally attacks with the greateſt violence. Thus much for the Annotation with which the Letter-writer has been pleaſed to lard his performance. One ſees (ſaith he, by way of inference from the profound remarks of the note) that Mr. *Pope*'s view was to ſurpaſs his original, which *it is ſaid*, was always his way when he imitated. That *Pope* did not al-

(3) Spectator, No. 291.

ways

ways improve what he borrowed I think I have in part already ſhewn: whether he in general altered what he borrowed for the better, we ſhall enquire elſewhere: and for the preſent take our leave of him, to proceed to the examination of what follows next, and that is his 12th Mark. "We "ſometimes, ſays he, *catch* an imitation lurking "in a licentious Paraphraſe," and under this he adds Sect 3, p. 46. he obſerves "that in the diſplay "of a borrowed thought the Imitation will gene-"rally fall ſhort of the Original, even though the "borrower be the greater genius." As an inſtance of this, he tells us that *Taſſo* ſays ſublimely of the night—Uſci la Notte, e ſotto l'ali

Meno il ſilentio (4).

What is there very ſublime in this paſſage of *Taſſo*'s? There ſeems, in fact, to be no other meaning in this and what follows, but a deſire to commend *Taſſo*, and (agreeable to the practiſe of modern encomiaſts, whoſe ſterility, according to Ld. *Shafteſbury*, is ſuch, that they cannot praiſe but by detraction) an inclination to find fault with *Milton*. But the Letter-writer goes on to aſſert roundly and poſitively, without condeſcending to ſhew or to prove in the leaſt what he aſſerts, that — *Milton* has given a Paraphraſe of this paſſage, but very much below his original:

Now came ſtill evening, and twilight gray
Had in her ſober livery all things clad;
Silence accompany'd.—

(4) C. 5. St. 79.

It is

It is a very ſenſible obſervation of his own, p. 6. that we can ſeldom pronounce with certainty of Imitations without ſome external proof to aſſiſt us in the Diſcovery. To apply this to the caſe before us. Is there any external proof that *Milton* did imitate this paſſage of *Taſſo*'s? If there is, why is it not produced: Without it there is not the leaſt Probability or ſimilitude of Truth in what is here aſſerted. *Taſſo*, we know very well, was one whom *Milton* particularly eſteemed, and deſervedly ranked with *Virgil*; but that he has borrowed from him in (or as he ſo peremptorily affirms, has given a paraphraſe of) this paſſage is abſolutely improbable. To aſſert that one paſſage is a paraphraſe of another, where there is ſcarcely any reſemblance, is ſomething big with abſurdity. The ſtriking part of *Taſſo*'s Picture, we are told is "*Night's bringing* "*in ſilence under her wings.*" So new and ſingular an Idea as this *had detected* an Imitation: ſtrange Language! Here it muſt be obſerved, that the only Identical circumſtance that occurs in both Poets is that of ſilence? And is this ſo new and ſingular, is this Idea of the night which is ſo very obvious that it muſt occur to thouſands that never heard of Poets or Poetry; is this what detected an Imitation? No; but the ſingularity is night's bringing it in under her wings. The wings of night is a pretty ſingular circumſtance, but frequent in *Taſſo* (4). Our Author goes on. *Milton* contents himſelf, then, with ſaying ſimply, ſilence accom-

(4) See his Gieruſalemme Liberata, C. viii. St. 57. C. xi. St. 82. Gier. Conq. L. 4. St. 26.

pany'd

pany'd. [Simply,] *i. e.* idly, at random, ſo he uſes the word, which he prints in Italicks in the next page. Even *Lauder* has ſome followers, no wonder if W. W. has. Long before this elaborate Performance appeared a Friend of mine had inſerted in his interleaved *Milton* theſe words from *Taſſo*:

——— *La notte,*
Quando tutte in alto ſilentio eran le coſe (5).

Does not this paſſage bear equal reſemblance to *Milton* with what is adduced? It certainly does: *Milton* ſays nothing here of the wings of night, and nothing can be ſo prepoſterous as to urge that as an Imitation, where there is not the moſt diſtant reſemblance to the principal point in queſtion. To return to the Letter-writer. "However, ſays he, to "make amends, *as he thought*, for this defect, Night "itſelf, which the Italian had merely perſonized, the "Engliſh Poet not only perſonizes, but employs in "a very becoming office.

Now came ſtill evening on, and twilight gray
Had in her ſober livery all things clad.

As for the Perſonization of Night, either in the Italian, or Engliſh Poet, it is a meer Phantom of his Imagination, and juſtly to be ranked with *I levi ſogni erranti* the other part of night's work in *Taſſo*—

Meno il ſilentio e i levi ſogni erranti.

But where did the Letter-writer learn the hiſtory of *Milton*'s thoughts? [To make amends as he thought.]

(5) Gi. Liber. c. 12. St. 36. add to this, c. 2. St. 95, 96. c. 6. St. 103. where is a Deſcription of Night worthy to be confronted with *Milton*'s, c. 8. 16. c. 13. St. 5. In all theſe paſſages the ſilence of the Night is mentioned, and who but a profeſſed Critic would from this infer an Imitation?

Profound

Profound Critick! Profound Thinker! Such is the critical, ſuch the note-writing of the preſent age, that the dealers in theſe branches of learning not only inform us what aſſiſtance the Authors they are particularly conſidering had in their eyes, but alſo what they had in their thoughts. This to be ſure greatly edifies their readers; ſuch among them at leaſt as readily ſubſcribe their aſſent to every thing that is produced in print. He next of all tells us, that "every body will obſerve a little "blemiſh in this fine couplet. That he ſhould not "have uſed the Epithet *ſtill*, when he intended to "add *Silence* accompanied:" he ſhould not have ſaid every body, becauſe all do not wear critical Spectacles, and really they are of little uſe, if they do not ſerve to better purpoſes than they have done to ſome who ſtile themſelves Criticks by Profeſſion. But why ſhould not *Milton* have uſed the Epithet *ſtill?* is there any thing repugnant in the Ideas of ſtillneſs and ſilence? They are not tautological though they convey nearly the ſame Image: but there is a "worſe fault, ſays he, in this Imita-"tion:" if for what he aſſerts he had a real proof and reaſon he could not ſpeak more peremptorily. There is nothing in the two prſſages ſo ſtriking or ſimilar as to demand any rational aſſent that it is an Imitation: all reaſoning therefore of courſe comes to nothing. However, he tells us that—"to hide it he ſpeaks of night's livery." If right I read this paſſage, the ſober livery is the Adjunct to the Twilight gray; nor is there one ſyllable in this paſſage of night's livery. Here then is a miſrepreſentation

ſentation of *Milton*, and fact, whether from inadvertence or deſign is beſt known to the author. Luckily for truth Our Poet ſtiles this ſpace of Time—ſhort arbiter twixt day and night (6). And it is evident to all that can read this Deſcription, that it is intended to depaint the Evening or commencement only of the night; and therefore muſt in that reſpect be diſſimilar to this of *Taſſo*'s. The progreſſive Beauties of this lovely deſcription are ſuch and ſo many, that the whole has been always looked upon to be ſo abſolute, thet it was impoſſible for critical cavil to nibble at it: but this miſtake is now too apparent. Having ſhewn that *Milton* ſays nothing of night's Livery, the Refinement which follows muſt go for nothing. "When "he had done that (ſc. ſpoke of night's livery) "to ſpeak of her wings had been ungraceful." "Therefore (he tells us) he is forced to ſay ob- "ſcurely as well as *ſimply* (7), Silence accompa- "nied: and ſo loſes a more noble Image for a leſs "noble one." What great nobility is there in the wings of night? By a common poetical alluſion Time is deſcribed with wings: from hence it ſhould ſeem, (or he might have derived it from the Antients) (8) — *Taſſo* has aſcribed them to Night, a particular part of it. Now as *Milton* takes no notice in the place before us of the wings of night,

(6) P. L. B. 9. v. 50.

(7) Qu. what is the meaning of this word ſimply, if what is before given it be not the true one?

(8) Nox ruit & fuſcis tellurem amplectitur alis. Æneid 8. 369.

this

this muſt be an argument with every one that he has not imitated the paſſage before us. And though this attribute of Silence be frequent in all the Poets, yet ſurely *Milton* may be allowed the uſe of it without alluding to any. Believing, we may ſuppoſe, the reality of what he has before aſſerted, he tells us *the Truth is, they would not ſtand together. Milton* then, according to this elegant Author, took Livery inſtead of wings. What a pity it is that we have no evidence to corroborate what is here ſurmized? For the truth is that this ſurmize has not the leaſt appearance of truth. Let us get through what follows as briefly as we may. Livery, he ſays, belongs to human grandeur — True enough: and yet in *Milton* we read of a Thouſand liveried Angels (9), and the propriety of this expreſſion has not hitherto been cavilled at.—*Wings* to *divine and celeſtial*—." And yet in the *Italian* Poets and *Milton* the Devils are always deſcribed with wings. We are now arrived at the concluſion. " So that, he infers, in *Mil-*" *ton*'s very attempt to ſurpaſs his Original, he put " it out of his power to employ the Circumſtance " that moſt recommended it." He takes that for granted which he ought really to have proved, and that is, that *Milton* did really imitate this ſame paſſage of *Taſſo*'s: to this end he ſhould have brought in the external evidence of Hiſtory: every thing elſe is but unſupported Fancy and Conjecture for which there is no manner of Foundation in fact. The only ſimilar circumſtance in both poets, if that of

(9) The Maſk, v. 455.

Silence in the Italian, it is that of the Night—in the Engliſh that of a fine ſtill Evening or the approach of the night: and admitting that this circumſtance could not occur to our countryman, what proof have we that he had recourſe to this ſame paſſage of *Taſſo* in preference to any other in his works? In Fact we have none at all: but inſtead of this are preſented with bare unſupported aſſertion. In confirmation of what has been here urged it will be neceſſary to oppoſe the Author to himſelf: or in other words, to produce ſuch paſſages from him as entirely corroborate the argument advanced againſt the whole of what we have been laſt examining. "Sentiments, ſays he, may be ſtrikingly ſimilar or even "identical, without the leaſt thought or even effect of a preceding original." He obſerves farther—"That the leaſt imaginable variations either in the terms, or the ſtructure of them, not "only deſtroys the Identity, but often diſfigures the "reſemblance to that degree that we hardly know "it to be a reſemblance." (1) If we do not know a reſemblance, how can we know an Imitation? Theſe laſt cited places contain rational truths, and, as there is very little reſemblance betwixt *Milton* and *Taſſo* in thoſe parts of their works we have been conſidering, they demonſtrate the Little probability of our Countryman's *paraphraſing* the Foreigner. I have been thus tedious in pointing out the nothingneſs of the whole here before aſſerted, leſs will be required in the examining what follows.—

(1) Letter, p. 60, 61.

The

The Critic by profeſſion, from whom he is ſo fond of *copying, or rather ſtealing* (2), it is evident from his notes on *Milton*, has no reliſh for him: *true taſt but ſeldom is the Critick's ſhare.* Following his foot-ſteps ſpeaking of *Milton*, he ſays—"He is not happier on another occaſion: and in proof of this cites from *Spenſer*—

Virtue gives herſelf light, thro' darkneſs for to wade.

And ſubjoins that *Milton* catched at this Image (did he lay hold of it?) and has run it into a ſort of Paraphraſe in thoſe fine lines:

Virtue could ſee to do what virtue would
By her own radiant light, tho' Sun and Moon
Were in the flat ſea ſunk.—

I need not aſk to which Poet the preference is due. The ſuppoſed Paraphraſt conveys in his elegant lines as good a moral as the antient bard: and the notion of virtue's doing what ſhe would by her own light is as good a leſſon, as that of giving herſelf light to wade thro' darkneſs. And as to the verſification it is not worth while to make a compariſon. *Spenſer*'s is ſuch, that it could not but have offended our Poets ear: the pace of the verſe — Thro' darkneſs for to wade is ſuch, as he juſtly condemned in a line of Bp. *Hall*'s

With tragic ſhoes her ancles *for to* hide (3).

(2) Ib. p. 57. (3) Proſe Works, p. 120. v. 1. Ed. 1738.

But that *Milton* was very happy in his Imitations from *Spenſer* is I think evident from this inſtance here produced, and this will appear ſtill more clearly from what follows. And we may obſerve in general that wherever he imitates he is ſure to excel. In the Maſque the Spirit thus ſpeaks of a certain Shepherd Lad.—

He lov'd me well and oft would beg me ſing
Which when I did, he on the tender graſs
Would ſit and liſten even to extaſie.

This will appear with uncommon ſpirit by comparing it with what *Spenſer* ſays of the Shepherd of the Ocean.

He ſitting me beſide in that ſame ſhade
Provoked me to play ſome pleaſant fit.
And when he heard the muſicke which I made
He found himſelf full greatly pleaſed at it (3).

I love *Spenſer*, and will not debaſe him to aggrandize *Milton*; but I cannot help remarking the Superiority of the Idea in the laſt cited Line of *Milton* to what we meet with in the laſt of *Spenſer*: *whoſe Poems*, (we have the Hiſtorical Evidence of the Ingenious Stationer *Moſeley*,) *in theſe Engliſh ones of Milton were as rarely imitated as ſweetly excelled.* Thus much for this Mark. Proceed we to the next, which is the 13th in order, and is, "that the Imitator not "merely ſpreads as it were and lays open the ſame "ſentiment, but adds to it, and by a new and ſtudied

(3) Colin Clouts come home again.

device

"device improves upon it." This Mark is a thorough Confirmation of what is before advanced (4), that the Marks of Imitation as he ſtiles them, ſo far from determining what is really Imitation, and what is not, are inconclufive, unconvincing, and determine nothing in the matter. To illuſtrate this mark he has this Quotation from *Shakeſpear*—

He cannot long hold out theſe Pangs;
The inceſſant care and labour of his mind
Hath wrought the mure, that ſhould confine it in
So thin, that life looks through, and will break out.

"You have here, he tells his learned Friend, and rea-
"ders, the thought in its firſt *Simplicity*." He goes a ſtep farther. "*Daniel* by refining on the Sentiment,
"if by nothing elſe, ſhews himſelf to be the Copy-
"iſt—Speaking of the ſame Henry he obſerves—"

(5) And pain and grief inforcing more and more,
Beſieg'd the hold that could not long defend;
Conſuming ſo all the reſiſting ſtore
Of thoſe proviſions Nature deſign'd to lend,
As that the walls worn thin, permit the mind
To look out thorough and its frailty find.

If it were true that *Daniel* did refine on this ſentiment of *Shakeſpear*'s it were moſt certain that he was a Copyiſt from him. Here again he takes that for granted which he ought to have proved, and begs the queſtion with a vengeance. Mark here the dif-

(4) P. 10. (5) Letter, p. 50.

ference

But that *Milton* was very happy in his Imitations from *Spenſer* is I think evident from this inſtance here produced, and this will appear ſtill more clearly from what follows. And we may obſerve in general that wherever he imitates he is ſure to excel. In the Maſque the Spirit thus ſpeaks of a certain Shepherd Lad.—

> He lov'd me well and oft would beg me ſing
> Which when I did, he on the tender graſs
> Would ſit and liſten even to extaſie.

This will appear with uncommon ſpirit by comparing it with what *Spenſer* ſays of the Shepherd of the Ocean.

> He ſitting me beſide in that ſame ſhade
> Provoked me to play ſome pleaſant fit.
> And when he heard the muſicke which I made
> He found himſelf full greatly pleaſed at it (3).

I love *Spenſer*, and will not debaſe him to aggrandize *Milton*: but I cannot help remarking the Superiority of the Idea in the laſt cited Line of *Milton* to what we meet with in the laſt of *Spenſer*: *whoſe Poems*, (we have the Hiſtorical Evidence of the Ingenious Stationer *Moſeley*,) *in theſe Engliſh ones of Milton* were *as rarely imitated as ſweetly excelled*. Thus much for this Mark. Proceed we to the next, which is the 13th in order, and is, "that the Imitator not "merely ſpreads as it were and lays open the ſame "ſentiment, but adds to it, and by a new and ſtudied

(3) Colin Clouts come home again.

device

"device improves upon it." This Mark is a thorough Confirmation of what is before advanced (4), that the Marks of Imitation as he ſtiles them, ſo far from determining what is really Imitation, and what is not, are inconcluſive, unconvincing, and determine nothing in the matter. To illuſtrate this mark he has this Quotation from *Shakeſpear*—

He cannot long hold out theſe Pangs;
The inceſſant care and labour of his mind
Hath wrought the mure, that ſhould confine it in
So thin, that life looks through, and will break out.

"You have here, he tells his learned Friend, and rea-"ders, the thought in its firſt *Simplicity*." He goes a ſtep farther. "*Daniel* by refining on the Sentiment, "if by nothing elſe, ſhews himſelf to be the Copy-"iſt—Speaking of the ſame Henry he obſerves—"

(5) And pain and grief inforcing more and more,
Beſieg'd the hold that could not long defend;
Conſuming ſo all the reſiſting ſtore
Of thoſe proviſions Nature deſign'd to lend,
As that the walls worn thin, permit the mind
To look out thorough and its frailty find.

If it were true that *Daniel* did refine on this ſentiment of *Shakeſpear*'s it were moſt certain that he was a Copyiſt from him. Here again he takes that for granted which he ought to have proved, and begs the queſtion with a vengeance. Mark here the dif-

(4) P. 10. (5) Letter, p. 50.

ference

ference betwixt the Letter-writer and *Theobald* (6), whom after the example of the Critic by profeſſion he affects to deſpiſe, notwithſtanding to him he ſeems indebted for this quotation of *Daniel*'s. The *latter* ſays modeſtly enough — I don't know the Date of that Poem being wrote (he is ſpeaking of the Civil Warres of England by *Daniel*) (7), ſo cannot ſay which Poet has copied from the other. He then has the ſame quotation as the above, and he has taken care to print the ſtriking part in roman letters. The *former* tells us at once without having any regard to the time when the two performances were publiſhed, that *Daniel* copied *Shakeſpear*, but that he did not will appear by this very obvious reaſon. The different times in which theſe two works were publiſhed, demonſtrate the truth before aſſerted—that *Daniel* did not copy from *Shakeſpear*. There are by good luck two Editions of the Civill Warres of England, in which this paſſage occurs, with ſome variation (8), but with none as to the article of reſemblance, the one printed at London 1595, and has but four bookes, the other has five, and was printed 1599: One year as it

(6) Ib. p. 74. (7) See his Shakeſpear, v. 3. p, 515. 1ſt Ed.

(8) In both theſe Editions the four laſt lines are as follows: B. 3. St. 116.

And ſo conſum'd all that imboldning ſtore
Of hote gain-ſtriving bloud that did contend
Wearing the *wall* ſo *thin* that now the *mind*
Might well *looke thorow* and his frailty find.

Theobald cites this from B. 4. St. 84. I have not ſeen the Edition where it occurs.

ſhould

ſhould ſeem before the ſecond part of Henry the Fourth, by *Shakeſpear*, made its appearance from the preſs (9). When the Letter-writer then ſhall bring in hiſtorical proof that *Daniel* did copy from *Shakeſpear*, by producing an Edition of the ſecond part of Henry the Fourth prior in time to *Daniel*'s work— When beſides this he ſhall ſhew the Impoſſibility of two writers uſing the ſame ſingle ſentiment without any knowledge of each other, then, and not till then, will it be probable that *Daniel* is in this Inſtance the Copyiſt of *Shakeſpear*. I will not retort upon him and aſſert that *Shakeſpear* was the Copier here, though it appears moſt evidently that *Daniel*'s work was prior to *Shakeſpear*'s, for this reaſon: becauſe ſome identical detached ſentiments cannot but occur to different writers (1). To illuſtrate this by a remarkable Inſtance from the Antients. *Horace* has ſaid —

Omnes una manet Nox
Et *calcanda* ſemel *via* leti.
Lib. 1. Od. 28.

Were I to ſpeak in the Language of the Letter-writer, I ſhould ſay that we had here the thought

(9) Theobald in his liſt of the ſeveral Editions of Shakeſpear's Plays, places that of the year 1600 as the firſt Edition of it, and its title carries marks of its being ſuch: for in ſeveral of Shakeſpear's Plays in Quarto, where they are not the firſt Editions, we have various marks to direct us that they are not ſo: as for inſtance, ſome ſuch words as theſe---newly corrected, newly augmented, with new Additions and the like, none of which preſent themſelves in this Edition.

(1) See this theſis judiciouſly illuſtrated by Dr. Kirk-Patrick in the Preface to the Sea-piece,

in its

in its firſt ſimplicity: and aſſert that *Propertius* by refining on the Sentiment, if by nothing elſe, ſhew'd himſelf to be the Copyiſt. He treating the ſame ſubject has a moſt ſimilar expreſſion:

Eſt mala, ſed cunctis Iſta *terenda* via eſt (2).

The caſe here is exactly parallel to this of the Letter-writer's. *Horace* and *Propertius* were both cotemporaries, as well as *Shakeſpear* and *Daniel*. In the Antients, if both may not be allowed to be originals, it muſt remain impoſſible to determine with certainty whoſe performance was firſt. With the moderns the caſe is different and more clear: we can judge of the time when their works were wrote from their publication. Theſe two paſſages bring to our memory another from *Shakeſpear*, which we may ſuppoſe to have occurred to him without alluding to either of theſe Antients.

All our yeſterdays have lighted fools
The *way* to duſty death (3).

He has the credit of having had *ſmall Latin:* had he been as great a pilferer from the Antients as Johnſon we ſhould have pronounced theſe verſes

And tune his merry note
Unto the ſweet Birds throat (4).

An imitation of Tibullus's,

Dulce ſonant tenui gutture carmen aves (5).

(2) L. 3. 16. (3) MACBETH. (4) As you like it. (5) L. 1. l. 3.

The

The Letter-writer has given us here a proof of his little regard to Chronology. There is no other Inſtance of it in his Work before; aud occurs, p. 24. There he tells us—" *Shakeſpear* might have learned " almoſt all the ſecrets of Paganiſm from the Maſks " of *B. Johnſon*:" How true this is will appear from hence. Very few of *Johnſon*'s Maſks were wrote in *Shakeſpear*'s Life-time, and hardly any of them printed till the year of his death. Men of learning have ſometimes fallen into theſe miſtakes, which when we are not infeſted with dogmatical Inferences from them, are juſtly to be laid to the ſcore of human frailty and inadvertence. Dr. *Newton* in his elegant Edition of *Milton*'s Poems has the Concurrence of Mr. *Thyer* in an Obſervation of his—that the *Il Penſeroſo* of *Milton*, both in its Model and principal Circumſtances, is taken from a Song in the Nice Valor of *Fletcher*. Now it is a fact that this Song was never in print till two years after *Milton*'s Poems were publiſhed: for the Stationer *Moſeley* in his Edition of *Beaumont*'s and *Fletcher*'s Plays, printed 1647, in his addreſs there to the readers, tells them *it is all new*. As this is a true ſtate of the caſe, the probability of *Milton*'s copying from *Fletcher* is entirely removed. It is true there is a reſemblance in the beginning of the *Il Penſeroſo* to the firſt line in the Song—Hence all you vain delights—but this is no proof of Imitation. There is a Diſtich in the voluminous *Sylveſter* which we have as much reaſon to ſuppoſe engaged the Poets attention as this Song; the likeneſs is certainly as ſtriking:

Hence,

Hence, hence falſe pleaſures, momentary Joyes,
Mock us no more with your illuding Toyes.
Workes, Ed. 1621. p. 1084.

Cotemporary writers of eſtabliſhed reputation may certainly be allowed the privilege of deſcribing ſimilar facts, or identical ſubjects without any ſuſpicion of borrowing or copying from one another. Thus for inſtance, to ſuppoſe *Johnſon* a Copier from *Shakeſpear* in the affair of Witchcraft, were altogether abſurd, notwithſtanding his works afford various particulars in this head which are to be met with in the Bard of Avon. *Shakeſpear* in this inſtance ſeems to have derived his knowledge from the common ſuperſtitious chit-chat of his lower cotemporaries. *Johnſon* on the other hand directs his readers in his notes to the antients and ſuch of the moderns as had particularly treated this ſubject: what *Milton* alſo ſays on this head ſeems principally to be taken from the ſame quarter as *Shakeſpear's*: he plainly alludes to the common converſation of the country when he mentions — "the ſtorys told of many a feat—"

How Faery Mab the junkets eat
She was pincht and pulld and ſhe *ſed*
And he by fryars lanthorn led
Tells how the druging goblin ſwet (6).

Take another example to the above obſervation. The fantaſtical manner of dreſs was never more con-

(6) L'allegro.

ſpicuous

ſpicuous among us than in the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's and the beginning of James the Firſt's time. Accordingly *Shakeſpear* has mentioned the faſhion-mongring boys (3), one of whom he tells us before will lye ten nights awake carving the faſhion of a new doublet. There is ſuch a genuine ſpirit in almoſt every thing that comes from his pen, that we can never with certainty call in queſtion the originality of any of his ſentiments: many of theſe he has in common with all mankind; but the dreſs in which he cloaths them is remarkably his own. This being premiſed, we may admit the *faſhion-mongring* Claudio to be a character formed from his own obſervation, notwithſtanding *Marſton* had deſcribed ſuch an one two years before him: for his Satires were firſt printed 1598, and reprinted the next year with an additional one:

This faſhion-mounger, each morne, fore he riſe
Contemplates ſute-ſhapes, and once from out his bed
He hath them ſtraight full lively portrayed (4).

Bp. *Hall* in his Satires (5), and ſeveral other writers about the year 1600 have touched upon this ſame ſubject. Thus much for this mark. Let us haſten to the laſt: and there he ſays—"I releaſe "you from this head of ſentiments with obſerving "that we ſometimes conclude a writer to have had "a celebrated original in his eye, when without "copying the peculiar thought, or ſtroke of imagery

(3) Much ado about nothing. (4) Scourge of Villany, Sat. 10.
(5) Satyrs, b. 3. S. 1.

" he gives us only a copy of the Impreſſion it had " made upon him." This may juſtly be ſtiled the crown of the whole performance, as it over-tops every other ſage remark of the Letter-writer's. For this is the ſtrangeſt mark of Imitation any where to be met with, or which ever entered any one's thoughts but the author's—that one writer ſhould copy another, and yet not make uſe of either the peculiar thought or ſtroke of Imagery. How can an Imitation ſubſiſt without one or other of theſe? One ridiculous aſſertion, we may infer from this, generally produces another: and admitting the reality of this, *Milton* may be allowed to have copied *Taſſo*'s wings of night (6), though in his deſcription of the Even he has taken no notice of this peculiar thought, or made any uſe at all of this remarkable ſtroke of imagery. What he ſays under this head being entirely without proof, it is therefore to be credited accordingly, and is the reſult not of his own obſervation, but is drawn from one of the many unmeaning notes with which his late Editor decorated *Shakeſpear*, whom notwithſtanding he here and elſewhere treats with ſome of that which he tells us—" the teeming ſoil of human " depravity throws forth (7)." This being foreign to our purpoſe, let us conſider what he ſays farther. *Milton* he tells us ſays of Death, that he " *grinn'd horribly a ghaſtly ſmile.*" and he adds upon this, that a friend of his was of opinion that this might be copied from *Spenſer*'s *Grinning grieſly.*

(6) See p. 25. (7) His Horace, v. 2. p. 36.

After

After all he *ſuſpects* if he had any preceding writer in view it might be *Fletcher*, in his *Wife for a Month:* who has this line of death.

And his ſhrunk hollow eyes ſmil'd on his ruin.

His aſſertions now are converted into ſuſpicions, and certainly miſtakes in opinion are readily to be excuſed when they are not delivered poſitively and dogmatically. That *Milton* copied this paſſage we have no manner of proof: and *Shakeſpear* having ſome lines which more nearly reſemble this, than what we have from *Fletcher*, the probability that *Milton* had his eye on the latter ceaſes. In King John, Act 3. Sc. 3. Lady Conſtance exclaims —

Death, Death, oh amiable lovely Death—
Come *grin* on me and I will think thou *ſmil'ſt*

This is the laſt of his Marks, from whence he thinks he may be allowed to infer an Imitation in point of Sentiment. By way of prelude to his next head— the conſideration namely of ſuch marks as ſeem to ariſe from Identity of expreſſion, he tells us, p. 59. "When I ſpeak of expreſſion then I mean to con- "fine myſelf to ſingle words or ſentences, or at moſt "the Structure of a paſſage. When Imitation is "carried ſo far as to affect the general caſt of Lan- "guage, or what we call a Style, no great ſaga- "city is perhaps required to detect it." In confirmation of this he tells us — "the later Roman "Poets, as well as the modern Latin verſifiers are to the beſt of their Power, *Virgilian*." This is ano-

ther vague ſtrange aſſertion. There is ſuch a viſible difference in the ſtile of the Poets who wrote in the later ages of the Roman Empire, that they do not ſeem to have made any of the Auguſtan age their models in writing: nor will this hold good of the modern Latin Verſifiers in general. It cannot be aſſerted that they are *Virgilian*. What ſhall we ſay to ſuch a Poet as *Buchanan*? He is one who reflects a diſtinguiſhed honour on his country, and in his inimitable *Franciſcanus*, is maſter of a ſtyle as elegant, and as peculiarly his own, as we may ſuppoſe that of the antient Satyriſts *Juvenal* and *Horace* to have been. As much may be ſaid of the Latin Poems of *Milton*. The Style of theſe is perfectly claſſical, and at the ſame time peculiar only to him. His Elegies are penned in the manner of his favourite (8) *Ovid*, and *Tibullus*, and here he has only made uſe of a verſification in common with theſe; and we read him with the ſame pleaſure as we ſhould have done, had he been their cotemporary. We have his own Authority (9), that he found the Imitation of the ſmooth Elegiac Poets eaſy and moſt agreeable to nature's part in him, and yet it is evident he has only adopted their manner, not ſervilely borrowed

(8) *His Favourite Ovid.* *Milton* ſeems to have had an high Opinion of him, as appears from his firſt Elegy.

O utinam vates nunquam graviora tuliſſet
Ille tomitano flebilis exul agro;
Non tunc Jonico quicquam ceſſiſſet Homero
Neve foret victo laus tibi prima Maro. V. 20.

(9) Smectymnuus Apology, p. 110. Ed. 1738.

their

their diction. The only one among his Latin Poems that has the appearance of being *Virgilian* is the *Epitaphium Damonis*, and this may be looked on as much an Imitation of Theocritus as of Virgil. What ſhould debar him from having recourſe to the Fountain-head? But what among the antients is there ſuperior, rather what is there equal to his *Manſus?* Happy old Man! That haſt thy name immortalized by two as great Poets (1) as any age ever produced, and art diſtinguiſhed as the moſt illuſtrious Patron of Letters of all who have lived—

Poſt Galli cineres & mæcenatis Etruſci!

As theſe Poems were moſtly wrote before their Author was twenty, *Milton* might with much juſtice have ſaid, as *Lucan* did, of himſelf:

Eſt mihi, crede, meis animus conſtantior annis,
Quamvis nunc juvenile decus mihi pingere malas
Cæperit & nondum viceſſima venerit æſtas (2).

Come we now to his marks of derived expreſſion, and his firſt obſervation under this head is—"An Identity "of expreſſion, eſpecially if carried on through an "intire ſentence, is the moſt certain proof of Imitation." It is a much ſurer proof of borrowing, and this is ſomething very different from Imitation: for this laſt, to ſpeak in general, is formed upon the manner only in which any work, or particular

(1) Taſſo and Milton.

(2) Panegyricus ad Calphurnium Piſonem, p. 121. Epigram. & Poem. Vet. Paris 1590.

paſſage is wrote. Thus for inſtance, we have in *Dodſley*'s Miſcellanies ſeveral profeſſed Imitations of *Spenſer:* but in theſe we find his model only made uſe of, not Stanzas or even lines inſerted from him. So in Mr. *Maſon*'s elegant, and notwithſtanding his Imitations, let me add very original Poem of *Muſæus*, the polite author has exactly imitated the ſtyles and manner of the ſeveral Poets he introduces ſpeaking: but he does not appear to have borrowed ſo much as a verſe from either of the bards he is imitating. From Poetry let us turn our Thoughts to the ſiſter art of painting; and ſuppoſe a young performer chooſing for his model the works of *Buonaroti*, *Tintoret*, or any other eminent artiſt, ſhould he give us copies of their works as the real produce of his own invention, we might in this inſtance ſtigmatize him as a borrower or plagiary, as much as the Poet who makes uſe of another's lines: but ſhould he copy their manner only, either in his colourings, or in the choice of ſimilar ſubjects, and not ſervilely ſteal particular objects from them, in this caſe nothing hinders but that he might be ſuppoſed as much an original as thoſe whoſe works he intended to form himſelf upon. There is this difference then between the Imitator and the borrower: the former writes on another's plan, or perhaps detached paſſages only; whereas the latter contents himſelf with ſubſtituting another's very words (and ſentiments of courſe) with little or no variation into his own work. *Waller* affords us ſeveral Inſtances of the truth of this Obſervation, and that this line of his is borrowed

rowed literatim, except in the firſt word, from *Spenſer*, is indiſputable

When laviſh Nature in her beſt attire:
There laviſh Nature in her beſt attire (3).

Nor is this the only one which this Poet has borrowed: here is another, which with the ſame Variation as the laſt, is taken from *Fairfax*.

And *ſince* he could not ſave her with her dy'd (4).
And *for* her could not (5), *&c.* ——

In another place he does but barely allude to, or at moſt adopt a ſingle phraſe from him, as in theſe lines:

There publick care and private paſſion fought
A doubtful combat in his noble thought.

Which doubtleſs are imitated from theſe in *Fairfax*:

For in the ſecret of her troubled thought
A doubtful combat love and honour fought.

To make the reſemblance appear the ſtronger, as it ſhould ſeem, the Letter-writer tells us, that publick Care is the Periphraſis of honour and private Paſſion of love. That by private paſſion is meant the King's love will admit of no doubt: but that publick care is the periphraſis of honour cannot ſo readily be be granted. The meaning of this whole paſſage is very obvious. Publick care ſignifies nothing more than that concern which the King, as father of his people, ought to have had for the publick, and it is oppoſed to his

(3) Spenſer Muiopotmos. See other Inſtances in Mr. *Fenton*'s elegant Obſervations on *Waller*, p. 113. 115. where the Poet, it is evident, has made uſe of the Tranſlator's words, and appropriated them to his own purpoſe.

(4) Waller. (5) Fairfax.

own

own private paſſion, or love.—Poets will often aſſert more than they know: how elſe could *Waller* have ſaid this of the King's thoughts? But let us take for granted what is here aſſerted, and ſuppoſe the Poet turned Hiſtorian, and as ſuch delivering plain matter of fact, the natural Inference from hence is, that the King's *care* for the *publick* at once gave way to the gratification of his own private paſſion, or he had never engaged in a match that proved ſuch a fruitful ſource of miſery to himſelf and people. But to reſume the ſubject in hand. We have ſeen the Poet in this laſt inſtance alluding to or at moſt borrowing a ſingle phraſe from *Fairfax*. There is an inſtance of his imitating *Taſſo* or *Fairfax* without ſo much as borrowing a Letter from either (6). Imitation then, it is evident, is different from borrowing. To proceed. His fourth mark is as follows. *An Imitation is diſcoverable*, ſays the Letter-writer, *when there is but the leaſt particle of the original expreſſion, by a peculiar and no very natural arrangement of words.* I fairly own I know not what to make of this mark: however, he has thought proper to inſert from the Faithful Shepherdeſs of *Fletcher* theſe lines.—

——————— In thy Face
Shines more awful Majeſty,
Than dull weak Mortality
Dare with miſty eyes behold,
And live:—

(6) Obſerv. on Waller, p. xc. But this is altogether uncertain, the ſame ſimile occurs in the Firſt Book of Lucan. V. 206.

And

And to obſerve as follows. The writer glanced, he tells us, but very improperly on ſuch an occaſion, at Deut. iv. 33. "Did ever people hear the "voice of God ſpeaking out of the midſt of the "fire as thou haſt heard, *and live?*" *The writer glanc'd—at Deut.* iv. 33.] How does the Letter-writer know this? Has he met with any ſecret hiſtory relating to *Fletcher* which the world is unacquainted with? If he has, why did he not communicate it? or did he think the world would believe him implicitly becauſe he ſaid this in print? Had he been amanuenſis, and handed the Bible to *Fletcher*, our Author could not have ſpoke more peremptory. But ſure I am there is not a glimpſe of probability in this aſſertion. There is equal certainty that, if this brief expreſſion is not to be allowed him as the genuine product of his own Invention, that he derived it from the Abſolution, or Exhortation to the ſick in our Liturgy, in both which places this expreſſion occurs. I am well nigh tired with the drudgery of tranſcribing the marks, but this I ſubmit to in order to ſhew their entire futility, and with this view proceed to the *fifth* (7). An uncommon *conſtruction* of words not identical, eſpecially if the ſubject be the ſame, or the Ideas ſimilar, will look like Imitation. *Milton*, ſays our Author, ſays finely of the Swan,

——————— The Swan with arched neck
Between her white wings mantling proudly
Rows her State.—

(7) Letter, p. 65.

I ſhould

I ſhould think, continues he, he might probably have that line of *Fletcher* in his head,

How like a Swan ſhe ſwims her pace!

Our author, we cannot but conclude here, is not very fortunate in his paralleliſms. The expreſſion *rows her State* is very different from *ſwims her pace*. So that I may reverſe his words and tell his learned friend—The expreſſion, you ſee, is NOT very like. Swimming is the natural pace of the Swan in the water; but to row her ſtate is a metaphor appropriated to her from human action. 'Tis true he goes on to ſay, the Image in *Milton* is much nobler. It is taken from a barge of State in a publick proceſſion. It is well we are told the barge muſt be in a publick proceſſion, we ſhould elſe be inclined to think ſhe moved with equal ſtate when ſingle and unaccompanied. But this elegant piece of Information is exactly in the ſtyle of the critick he is ſo ambitious of copying, who minutely tells his readers in his notes from whence every metaphor is taken (8). But is there any thing of certainty, any thing that has the leaſt air of probability (and if there is not, to what purpoſe do ſuch ridiculous ſurmiſes as theſe are ſerve?) that *Milton* deſcribing here the Swan, (to uſe the modern Phraſe?) had his eye on a publick proceſſion of Barges of State? It is ſomewhat amazing that neither the original, nor the Copier, in their profound remarks on *Milton*, have taken any notice of

(8) Vide the Canons of Criticiſm, Can. 20. Ex. 14.

the

the metaphor uſed in the paſſage quoted in this page of the *long levelled rule of light*. The former ſhould have ſaid—Metaphor taken from a Carpenter's rule and level — The follower ſhould have ſaid—It is taken from the long level uſed by Maſons in carrying on a great building, he might have done this as well as he has told us, that *Milton* took the Image of a Swan's rowing her ſtate from a barge of ſtate in a publick proceſſion. If there is any uſe to Literature in general in ſuch vague, ſtrange obſervations as theſe are, gentle reader — *candidus imperti*. Proceed we to the ſixth Mark. We may even pronounce that a *ſingle word* is taken, when it is new and uncommon. — To what purpoſe does it ſerve to pronounce this without producing ſome proof for what is here ſaid? If as we have ſhewn (9) in part already, and ſhall farther ſhew, it be no impeachment of the originality of an Author that he ſometimes makes uſe of a remarkable Phraſe which occurs in a former work, (1) what certainty can there be in what is hete aſſerted? What has *Euripides*'s ἡλίου Κανὼν σαφὴς viſible rule of the Sun to do with the long levelled rule of light ſtreaming *from* a ruſh candle in *Milton*? When we examine the two Poets minutely, it is viſible that there is ſcarcely a reſemblance, much leſs an Imitation, or what the author ſeems ſo ſure of a tranſlation. This deſerving ſmall credit we ſhall find what he makes an eighth Mark of imitated expreſſion to deſerve ſtill leſs. —

(9) P. 5.

" Where

"Where the word or phraſe is *foreign*, there is if "poſſible ſtill leſs doubt." Though he makes no doubt, yet true it is there is nothing that looks like certainty. He has here this quotation from *Milton*,

——— At laſt his ſail-broad vans
He ſpreads for flight. —

Moſt certainly, ſays he, from *Taſſo*'s,

Spiega al grand volo i vanni. ix.

He who is ſolely actuated by a love of truth will not poſitively aſſert more than he knows to be true. Can this be the Letter-writer's caſe in this Inſtance? Has he any abſolute proof that *Milton* did borrow this Phraſe from this very paſſage of *Taſſo*? There is really no certainty that he did; ſo far from it, that, notwithſtanding he was a favourite author with him, there is no manner of probability that he copied him in this place. To conſider the two Poets. *Milton* is ſpeaking of the Devil—*Taſſo* of the Archangel *Michael*: The two paſſages then are as diametrically oppoſite as light and darkneſs. But *Taſſo* actually gives to the Devils the ſame—

Toſto, ſpiegando in vari lati i vanni
Si furon queſte per lo mondo ſparti. C. 4.

Where now is the very great certainty that this is from this firſt-quoted paſſage of *Taſſo*? It is in Fact a non-entity: add to this; if the malevolent Spirit

Spirit of *Lauder* has ſo far diffuſed itſelf that *Milton* muſt on no accounts be allowed to have been ο Ποιητης, a Maker, yet if he could derive it from another quarter, and there is no direct proof that he had it hence, this very great certainty muſt of courſe ceaſe at once. What ſhall we ſay then to this Deſcription of the Devil in *Marino:* it is true he ſays nothing of the *vanni*, but he mentions his ſail-like wings for flight—

——— Per volar dibatte l'ali
Ch'en guis a ha pur didue gran vele aperte (1).

We may ſuppoſe *Milton*, from his particular intimacy with *Manſo* the illuſtrious Patron and Friend of theſe Poets, to have peruſed the writings of both, and can it be determined with certainty which of the two, or rather is there any certainty he made either of them the object of his imitation? I believe that muſt always remain unſettled. Now though there is no proof that *Milton* adopted his *Vans* from the Italian, yet poſſibly this ſame ſtanza of *Taſſo*'s was of ſome uſe to him: of the Archangel Michael he thus ſpeaks, B. 11.

He kingly from his ſeat
Inclin'd not.

Taſſo ſays the ſame Thing of the ſame perſon,

——— Duce de'guerrieri alati
S'inchinó riverente al divin piede (2).

Which *Fairfax* renders,

——— The winged warrior low *inclinde*
At his Creator's Feet with reverence due.

(1) Strage de gli Innocenti L. 1. St. 18. (2) Gier. Lib. 9. 60.

How far this may be probable the reader will judge when he is informed that it occurs likewiſe in *Dante*, who, (being the Hero of his own Poem) is directed by *Virgil* his guide to make himſelf eaſy and to *incline* to an Angel, they meet in their excurſions,

——— Quei ſe ſegno
Chi ſteſſi queto, & *inchinaſſi* adeſſo. Inf. 6. 9.

Landino's comment on this paſſage will ſerve as well for *Milton* as *Dante*. Chi *inchina*, ſays he, fa riverentia; & ſignifica *lo'nchinare* cedere al ſuperiore & eſſer pronto a ſottometterſi & a ubbedire. So Lot, as Diodati renders the paſſage, Gen xix. 1. upon ſeeing the Angels—Si levo per audar loro incontro: e *S'inchino* verſo terra. But the abſolute uncertainty of aſſerting with truth that any particular word or phraſe is borrowed from ſuch a writer, or, what is more, from any particular Language, will appear from what follows. Mr. *Thyer*, whoſe notes on *Milton* every reader cannot but in the whole admire, obſerves on this paſſage—

The morning Sun warmly ſmote the open field.

That it is plainly borrowed from the Italian Poets, and in confirmation of it quotes two lines from *Arioſto* where it occurs: to which let me add this from Petrarch, Canz. 7.

Neve non *percoſſa* dal ſol.

Now notwithſtanding this expreſſion be frequent in the

the Italian Poets, and it be admitted *Milton* was a reader of theſe, yet ſtill we want hiſtorical Evidence to prove that he actually borrowed it from them. In *Valerius Flaccus* we meet with—*percuſſa* que ſole—ſcuta virum (1). This Phraſe then is originally claſſical (2): and was *Milton* unacquainted with the writings of the Antients? Again. Whence had he this Line—

And freſh-blown roſes waſht in dew?

From *Shakeſpear* certainly.

——— She looks as clear
As morning roſes newly waſhed with dew (3).

How eaſy is it to aſſert! how difficult to prove! He has not told us that he did not take it hence—

Her lips like roſes over-waſht with dew (4).

Or from another quarter—ſuch as

——— Ci ſuole una roſa
Bagnata di rugiada piu piacere (5).

This inſtance, with ſuch as follow next, will ſerve to ſhew the great uncertainty of Imitation in general. And this will appear ſtill more clear when we come to reflect on the impoſſibility of determining from what quarter a writer may derive his knowledge of any

(1) L. 1. 496. 7.
(2) This expreſſion is ſcriptural alſo. See Iſaiah xlix. 10.
(3) Taming of the Shrew, Act 2. (4) England's Parnaſſus, p. 398. (5) Orlando Inamorato da Berni, L. 1. C. 4.

hiſtorical Fact. If this cannot be ſettled, how can Imitation be fixed? To illuſtrate this remark. In Paradiſe Loſt, B. 1. we have mention made of the Sea-Beaſt Leviathan—

Him hap'ly ſlumbring on the Norway foam
The Pilot of ſome ſmall night-founder'd ſkiff,
Deeming ſome iſland, oft, as Seamen tell,
With fixed anchor in his ſcaly rind
Moors by his ſide, under the lee, &c.

Mr. *Warton* tells us (6) it is likely that *Milton* derived this circumſtance of the miſtaking the whale for an Iſland from *Arioſto*, where certain perſons on ſight of the monſtrous fiſh Balæna, were of opinion it was a little iſle,

Ch'ella fia una Iſoletta ci credemo'.

This line he has printed in Capitals, and it muſt be acknowledged that it very nearly correſponds to *Milton*'s words *Deeming ſome Iſland*. *Harington*'s tranſlation is—we thought it was an Iſle. Let us admit the reſemblance betwixt the two Poets to be as ſtrong as can be deſired, yet ſtill the Imitation is not proved; Hiſtorick Evidence, which is abſolutely neceſſary to ſhew that our Poet copy'd the the Italian, being wanting, the whole of this obſervation can be deemed nothing more than unſupported conjecture: what ſhall we ſay to the obſervation of the learned Mr. *Upton* on this paſſage?

(6) Obſervations on Spenſer, 306.

In *Geſne*

n *Geſner* (ſays he) pag. 119. and in *Olaus Wormius* there is a print of a monſtrous whale, which the Sailors take for an Iſland, and fix their anchors in his ſkinny rind. This print *Milton* had in his mind, he tells us, when he wrote the ſimile in B. 1. 203. Where did Mr. *Upton* learn this Anecdote, of *Milton*, that he had ſeen this print which is mentioned by theſe two Authors? If he never ſaw it, he could hardly have it in his mind. In a word, there ſeems to be no manner of foundation for what is here aſſerted. I would not be underſtood as if I meant in the leaſt to reflect on the veracity of theſe Gentlemen who have ſo entirely diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the republick of Letters: I would only ſhew that very little regard is due to peremptory, poſitive, unſupported aſſertions, let them come from any pen or perſon whatſoever. Had either *Geſner* or *Wormius* mentioned this particular ſingly, had it eſcaped the notice of all other writers, and could this too be ſufficiently known, we might then be induced to think our Poet might have derived his knowledge of it from this Quarter, but as it occurs in various others that probability vaniſhes at once. To theſe then let us have recourſe. *Olaus Magnus* has a chapter (7) expreſsly, *De anchoris dorſo ceti impoſitis.* There he tells us—Habet cetus ſuper corium ſuum ſuperficiem tanquam fabulum quod eſt juxta littus maris: unde plerunque elevato dorſo ſuo ſuper undas, *a navigantibus nihil aliud creditur eſſe quam Inſula.* As

(7) Notes on Spenſer, p. 504. (8) Gent. Septentrion, Hiſt. L. 21, Cap. 17.

Milton mentions the Norway foam, why may we not ſuppoſe him alluding to this writer who has penned the Hiſtory of the northern world? I do not however aſſert any thing: we are neceſſarily inveloped in clouds of uncertainty; but we may be allowed to conjecture that *Milton* had read this work of *O. Magnus*, for theſe reaſons. As he wrote the Hiſtory of Muſcovy, we may ſafely preſume that he was lead to any author who had wrote any thing touching this quarter of the globe: and poſſibly he derived from him his notion of ſtone cannon, (againſt which *Bentley* was particularly ſevere) for ſuch he mentions, B. 9. c. 4. in the work before quoted. But *Milton*'s writings, though he was ſo great a reader, have as original an aſpect as *Shakeſpear*'s, though no doubt he has many Sentiments which are occaſionally to be met with in various authors, and here *the Pilots deeming it ſome Iſland, as Seamen tell*, is widely different from what we meet with either in *Arioſto* or *Olaus Magnus*. A ſtory of this kind could not eſcape the monkiſh writers (9). *Gazæus* the Jeſuit, who has burleſqued in latin verſe ſeveral of the legendary ſtories of the Popiſh Saints, deſcribes St. *Maclovius* [Malo] as celebrating Maſs upon a huge Ore in the Sea: *Toto vivendam colletergi ſe dedit Balæna grandis*— upon diſcovery of which the ſurprize of the perſon upon watch occurs in theſe words.

Excubitor alto tuitus e carcheſio
Cum voce dextram tollit, inſulam, inſulam,

(9) In the Golden Legend this ſame ſtory is told of a St. Brandon.

Illoque

Illoque flectunt vela; *jacitur Anchora*
Hæſura coſtis belluæ.

This laſt ſentence anſwers to *Milton*'s fixed Anchor in his ſcaly rind. The monſter too is deſcribed ſleeping—

——— Interim & ſimul ſuum
Balæna dormiendo captat prandium.

And is ſpoken of in two other places as an iſland. Some years back on meeting with this work, not having duly attended to this ſubject of Imitation in general, I made no doubt that I had certainly diſcovered a writer that had been of ſignal aſſiſtance to our great Poet; but there is not the leaſt certainty at all that *Milton* ever did peruſe him; for the whole of this circumſtance is adopted by the Jeſuit from a prior writer of this Saint's Life, *Surius* perhaps, or ſome other hiſtorian of equal authority. Let us briefly recapitulate what we have been laſt conſidering. Here are ſix Authors, all of whom mention the Sailors miſtaking a great fiſh for an Iſland: four of theſe have the ſame article of fixing the Anchor in his ſide; after theſe comes another, who has ſeveral particulars to be met with in the preceding writers, but however none ſtrong enough to make one believe he is more indebted to one than the other. It being impoſſible then to determine from what quarter a writer might derive his knowledge of any certain fact, unleſs there are real

proofs

proofs to ſhew the contrary, we ſhall find this argument to hold good in the affair of Imitation.

To demonſtrate ſtill more clearly the neceſſity of Hiſtorical Evidence, and in the want of that to ſhew the abſolute uncertainty of Imitation in general, where there is nothing but bare reſemblance, the following inſtance will ſerve. *Milton* in his third book ridicules that abſurd tenet of popery—that peoples being buried in a Friar's habit were ſure of Paradiſe. Whom does he imitate here? From whom does he borrow? or whence did he derive his knowledge of this? Was it from *Dante*, who places in his *Inferno*, c. 27. a *Conte de Montefeltro* notwithſtanding he took the habit of a Franciſcan,

——— Fu cordigliero
Credendo ſi cinto fare amenda?

Or did he learn this from *Wicliffe*, who mentions it in his treatiſe againſt the Friars? c. 20. Or from *Eraſmus* who laughs at it in his Πτωχοπλεσιοι and in his 1230th Epiſtle? Or from *Buchanan* in his inimitable Franciſcanus—

Quos febris, quos vexat dira phreneſis, &c.

Or laſtly, did he derive it from *Weever* in his diſcourſe of Funeral Monuments, p. 158? By theſe and by others in this thing mentioned. If there be no Evidence then to inform us that he derived his knowledge from any of theſe, he cannot be ſaid to have imitated either; for ſurely there is hardly any ſuch ſpecies of Imitation in a writer as may be deno-

be denominated caſual or undeſigned. But though we may have hiſtorical Evidence that a later Author had peruſed the work of a preceding writer, yet it may ſo happen that it may be impoſſible even here in the caſe of very ſtrong reſemblance, to conſtitute an Imitation. *Milton* here too furniſhes us with an inſtance to confirm the reality of this remark. In his Paradiſe Regained, B. 2. a work in which, as Mr. *Fenton* obſerves, there is a viſible falling off, (from almoſt every other performance he has left us, I may add) as it ſavours leſs of his genius, and in fact owes its exiſtence to a moſt impertinent and ſilly queſtion of *Elwood*'s (2), we have theſe verſes.

> Beſides, to give a Kingdom hath been thought
> Greater and nobler done, and to lay down,
> Far more magnanimous than to aſſume. V. 481.

With reverence to his memory be it ſpoken, the Poet has very improperly put into this ſpeech of our Saviour theſe notions of his, the reſult of his own reading and obſervation. Dr. *Newton* tells us *Diocletian*, *Charles* the Fifth, and others who have reſigned the crown were, no doubt, in our Author's thoughts on this occaſion. How far this was the caſe, who can determine? The ſentiment is trite and common: But what is moſt to our purpoſe is, that it occurs in two writers whom (we have his

(2) Thou haſt ſaid much here of Paradiſe Loſt; but what haſt thou to ſay of Paradiſe found? T. Elwood to Milton. See the Hiſtory of the former's Life, p. 246.

own evidence for what we aſſert) we know *Milton* had read. And firſt we may obſerve this paſſage is expreſſed very nearly in the words of Sir *Philip Sidney* and the Conduct of *Muſidorus* in the Arcadia, is an inſtance of what is here expreſſed: "He "thinking it a greater greatneſs to give a king-"dom than to get a Kingdom—did, after having "received the full power into his own hands, reſign "all to the nobleman (3)." Such alſo was the Behaviour of our *Athelſtan* upon reſtoring *Ludwal* King of Wales, and *Conſtantine* King of the Scots to their reſpective thrones, who, as the Monk of *Malmeſbury* relates it, pronounced it—glorioſius eſſe regem facere quam regem eſſe (4). That *Milton* had read both theſe writers appears from various places in his proſe works: yet who is there that can determine to which of theſe he is indebted for the Sentiment? But he might have had it from another Quarter; therefore there is nothing like Certainty that he had it from either. Sir *Thomas More* in his Hiſtory of *Richard* the Third, of the famous Earl of Warwick, ſays, that he made Kings and put down Kings almoſt at his pleaſure, and not impoſſible to have attained it himſelf, if he had not *reckoned it a greater thing to make a King, than to be a King* (5). We are now naturally brought back to the conſideration of *Stephens*'s argument, which is ſtrongly corroborated by what is here ad-

(3) B. 2. p. 228. Ed. 1725.

(4) W. Malmesburienſis de geſtis Anglorum, L. 2. Cap. 6.

(5) Sir Thomas More's Engliſh Works, Ed. 1557, p. 60.

vanced.

vanced. There is another place in *Milton*, which I ſhall conſider, and on this and the preceding will reſt what was principally propoſed to be ſhewn—the uncertainty of Imitation in general: And that is his addreſs to *wedded Love*. This we are told by a Friend of Dr. *Newton*'s, (and the Dr. acquieſces in it,) the Poet borrowed from one of *Taſſo*'s Letters. No two writers I may truly ſay could poſſibly treat one ſubject more differently, than theſe have done: in the *Italian* there is but little ſimilar, nothing ſtrictly identical with what we meet with in our countryman. *Taſſo*'s it is true is an Apoſtrophe to Matrimony, and in one part of it he ſays, *tu ci fai certi de figliuoli, & de'nipoti, ch'altramente incerti ſarebbono*. There is one paſſage which induces the learned Editor to agree with his Friend that *Milton* did imitate this ſame letter of *Taſſo*'s, and that is this particular—*la carita del figlinolo & del Padre*. But how little this is to be rely'd on will appear from what has been before obſerved, p. 52. and from hence. *Arioſto*, whoſe fifth Satyre *Dimoſtra eſſer buona coſa il maritarſi*, ſpeaking of an adulterer ſays,

Non ſa quel che ſia amor, non ſa che vaglia
La Caritade.

Why might not the Poet derive his word from hence? But of this enough. He has ſaid nothing of wedded Love but plain obvious truth, and ſuch as muſt have occurred to him had he only made uſe of thoſe ſenſes which God endued him with and never

never had recourſe to any books whatever: he has only done what a good Poet ſhould do, he has given truth the garb of ſplendid and ornamental Diction. Among the antients two Poets have Apoſtrophes to Marriage: one is very expreſs and full, and ſpeaks to the ſubject in general exactly in our Poet's manner, and he too was a favourite with him, and that is *Sophocles*, whoſe Ædipus thus exclaims—

——— ὦγάμοι, γάμοι
Ἐφύσαθ' ἡμᾶς, κὶ φυτεύσαντες, πάλιν
Αὐτῖτε ταυτὸν σπέρμα, κἀπεδείξατε
Πατέρας, ἀ δελφὲς, παῖδας, αἷμ' ἐμφύλιον;
Νύμφας, γυναῖκας, μητέρας τε (6).

So alſo *Catullus* in his Epithalamium.

——— Hymen ô Hymenæe
Nulla qui ſine te domus
Liberos dare, nec Parens
Stirpe jungier, at poteſt
Te volente.

Thus I think I have demonſtrated the uncertainty of Imitation in general: that it is by no means to be inferred from bare coincidence of ſentiment only, but that there ought to be much better proof, which can be no other than that of real evidence, to authenticate an Imitation or borrowing, without which the Originality of any good Author ſhould not be called in queſtion: but what is here ad-

(6) Ædipus Tyrannus, v. 1402.

vanced

vanced ſhould by no means be conſtrued to ſerve the purpoſes of ſuch as are indiſputably Copiers, the Imitators and ſmall Poets, whoſe works carry in themſelves genuine marks of the Imbecillity of the genius of their Parents. In this caſe we may proceed upon much ſurer grounds, as it is widely different from what we have been laſt conſidering: It is more particular, and reſpects theſe Individuals only. And here their character may go far towards aſſiſting us in our diſcovery of their reſources. For where verſifiers are notoriouſly defective as to their creative powers, where they are themſelves fond of proclaiming their own borrowings, there any party of theirs, which has a real Affinity to any thing to be met with in a preceding Work, is juſtly liable to the ſuſpicion of being thence derived, conſequently of being unoriginal. We have two Poets of this Stamp, who have been very open in their borrowings and Imitations. Theſe are *Ben Johnſon* and *Pope:* whom we may look upon as plunderers of Parnaſſus:

Thieves of Renown, and pilferers of Fame.

If we regard them in this view, though they ſeem to have been pretty much alike in the ſurlineſs of their tempers, and to have valued themſelves both upon their learning and ſcholarſhip, yet there will however appear ſome difference between them. *Johnſon*'s writings are one continued ſeries of Imitation and alluſion: where he not only literally tranſlates the antients, many paſſages from whom are transfuſed into his performances, and chime

in as regular and as if they were the product of his own invention; but he gleans as freely, and without reſerve, from the moderns when they make for his purpoſe. Thus for inſtance in his Epithalamion (7), it is plain he has derived the manner and part of the matter alſo from *Catullus* and *Spenſer*, from the latter of whom he has inſerted a diſtick almoſt *totidem verbis* without having given the leaſt hint of it. Again he is particularly careful—verbum verbo reddere fidus interpres, when he pilfers from the antients; we have abundant proof of this in the lines which follow,

——— They ſay you tax'd
The law, and lawyers; captaines; and the players
By their particular names. *Aut.* it is not ſo.
I us'd no name. My bookes have ſtill been taught
To ſpare the perſons, and to ſpeak the vices (8).

What an exact tranſlation is the two laſt lines of theſe in *Martial!*

Hunc novere modum noſtri ſervare libelli
Parcere perſonis dicere de vitijs (9).

In a word, ſuch a one was *Johnſon*, that he ſeems to have made it his ſtudy to cull out others ſentiments, and to place them in his works as from his own mint. This ſurely is an odd ſpecies of improvement from reading, and ſavours very little of Invention or Genius: It borders nearly upon, if it is not really plagiariſm. For according to

(7) Workes, Ed. 1616. Fol. p. 923. (8) Poetaſter, p. 356.
(9) L. 10. 33.

Thomaſius

Thomaſius—Qui fatetur per quem profecerit, reddit mutuum, qui non fatetur fur eſt (1). The only difference between the borrower and actual plagiary is but this—the one acknowledges, the other conceals his obligations. In this reſpect *Johnſon*'s character and *Pope*'s ſeem to tally: but *Johnſon*'s is different from his in another reſpect, and that is in his every where abounding with alluſions, which is a genteeler ſpecies of borrowing. One or two will ſerve as a ſpecimen. In the Alchemiſt, Act 1. Sc. 2. *Face* is perſuading *Dapper*, at all events, to ſee the Queen of Faerie:

> It will be ſomewhat hard to compaſſe: but
> However ſee her. You are made, believe it,
> If you can ſee her. Her Grace is a lone woman
> And very rich, and if ſhe take a phantſye
> She will do ſtrange things. See her at any hand.
> 'Slid ſhe may chance to leave you all ſhe has!

He alludes here to a vulgar notion prevalent in his own time, but forgotten now. I have heard it often, ſays Sir *John Harington* (2), among the ſimpler ſort, that he that can pleaſe the Queene of Faeries ſhall never want while he lives. In the next Scene Face ſays to Drugger—no gold about thee?

Dru. Yes I have a Portague, I ha' kept this half yeere.

Holinſhead in his Deſcription of Britaine, mentions the Portague as a Piece very ſolemnly kept of dy-

(1) De Plagio Literario, S. 66. (2) Orlando Furioſo, p. 337.

vers (3). This Cuſtom we are ſure from hence continued in his time. But a reader of *Johnſon* is continually teized with theſe. Drugger in this ſame Scene is ſaid to be—a neat, ſpruce, honeſt fellow, and no Goldſmith. A quaint diſtinction, *and no Goldſmith!* — It means poſſibly that he had not the *Chryſoſperme*, *i.e.* that he had not the Philoſopher's ſtone. It is however by no means obvious that this is the real meaning of this part of his character; and therefore it muſt remain hardly intelligible to the generality of his readers. Thus much for *Johnſon*, conſidered as a Maker, and who as ſuch has very poor pretenſions to the high place he holds among the Engliſh Bards, as there is no original manner to diſtinguiſh him, and the tedious ſameneſs viſible in his plots indicates a defect of Genius. Let us turn our thoughts to Mr. *Pope*, and ſee if we can hit upon his real Character, by avoiding the Shoals of detraction on one hand, and leaving the loads of adulation and flattery paid to his memory by Sicophants, on the other. From the exalted accounts of ſome, one might almoſt be induced to believe him the genius of Engliſh Poetry, and that he had carried it to the ſummit of Perfection. We have been told of the uncommon extent of his genius, that he was as ſuch ſuperior to *Horace*, that he excelled *Swift* in his own way, though the place (4) by the by from which this inference is made is *Swift*'s own writing; that he was ſuperior too in expreſſion to *Milton*, (great in-

(3) P. 117. 6. (4) Works, v. 6. 6 Sat. Horace, v. 125. v. Swift's Works, Dublin Ed. v. 2. 1735, p. 113.

deed!

deed!) and far exceeded all others as writer of Epitaphs: but — *Les louanges des Editeurs ſont ſuſpectes* (5). To judge of the Man from his writings, a privilege every reader has a right to, he appears ſomewhat different from what he has been delivered to us. Perhaps no writer was ever fonder of talking of himſelf than *Pope*, nor ever expreſſed more anxiety for future fame. To obtain this, his works are replete with numerous Phariſaical Boaſts of his own righteouſneſs. But this may be in ſome meaſure attributed to the religion in which he was educated, and to which he ſeems to have had a bigotted attachment. Hence he ſoon came to think too highly of himſelf, and in conſequence thereof to boaſt of his own works, and to deſpiſe all who dared in any thing to thwart or contradict him. Hence he could —

Bear like the Turk no brother near the Throne,

a juſt idea of him might be learnt from the ill-natured things he has ſaid of others. He has told us

He thought a lie in verſe or proſe the ſame?

What honeſt man ever thought otherwiſe? But then may one aſk, why did he ſuffer that paſſage concerning *Tibbald*, where he makes him puff his *Edition of Shakeſpear*, to have a place in a note in the Dunciad (6)? It ſeems he, poor man could

(5) Idee de la Poeſie Angloiſe par Yart, T. 1. p. 173.

(6) This Tibbald, or Theobald, publiſhed an Edition of Shakeſpear, of which he was ſo proud himſelf as to ſay, in one of Miſt's Journals, June 8, That to expoſe any errors in it was impracticable, and in another, April 27, That whatever care might for the future be taken *by any other Editor* he would ſtill give above five hundred emenda-

not be dunce enough without the aid of Untruth. It is to be feared his benevolent diſpoſition, though it is trumpeted forth by his Editor, and echoed by the follower is altogether chimerical. It is an obſervation of the French Critick above cited of the Dunciad, that *elle eſt pleine d'applications malignes* (7). There is no part of his works that ſhews his malevolence more than this, and the injuſtice of the man appears by comparing the different Editions with one another. There we find lines that had been appropriated to one fitted to another for whom they were not originally deſigned. Can there be any truth in ſuch Pictures? Did theſe ariſe from a love of virtue, or from perſonal pique? From the latter it is too much to be feared. But to have done with this Part of the Man, which we are told with an air of inquiſitorial dictatorſhip (8), we are

emendations that ſhall eſcape them all, Dunciad, B. 1. 133. For the words *by any other Editor* in the firſt Edition of the Dunciad, and particularly that of the year 29, we read--*either by Mr. P. or any other aſſiſtants*; and then Tibbald ſpoke this of his *Shakeſpear Reſtored*, if we are to believe Mr. Pope, and not of his Edition of him, which was not publiſhed till four years after, as he very well knew. Were words ſo ſcarce a commodity with *Tibbald*, that he was obliged to make uſe of the old ones again? And could he find no Days to repeat them but the ſame numerical Days that he had done before? This is too groſs an abſurdity to be admitted. It is plain that Pope in his rage of altering did not religiouſly ſtick to truth. *But chief in Tibbald's monſter breeding breaſt:* Here in a note to the above Edition he ſays---This alludes to the extravagancies of the Farces of that Author. Did it ſo? With what juſtice then could it be apply'd to Cibber? I am afraid not with any Poetical, that was not his Talent.

(7) Yart. T. 3. 50. (8) See the Advertiſement to the laſt Edition of Pope.

not

not to meddle with, and to come to that which is the ſubject of the preceding Enquiry. And here we muſt make another viſit to the Dunciad, and view the Hero there amuſing himſelf, as

—O'er his books his eyes began to roll,
In pleaſing memory of all he ſtole;
How here he ſipp'd, how there he plunder'd ſnug,
And ſuck'd all o'er like an induſtrious Bug (9).

one would think *Pope* look'd into himſelf when he wrote this, and loaded his Hero with his own Qualities: for certain it is, his writings are a perfect Cento—*undique collatis membris*, and he generally points out his own Imitations; ſo that they appear, as as *Butler* expreſſes it, like a Taylor's cuſhion of Moſaic work, made up of ſeveral ſcraps ſewed together (1): *ubi unus & alter aſſuitur Pannus.* In confirmation of this ſee

And you, my Critics! in the chequer'd ſhade,
Admire new light thro' holes yourſelves have made (2).

Here is a ſcrap from *Milton*, and a hint from *Waller*. But there is ſomewhat ſingular in *Pope*—while he is parodiſing one Poet he is alluding to another, as in —

Flow, Welſted, Flow, like thine *Inſpirer*, Beer.

But it was not in the Dunciad alone. It is hardly to be doubted that he formed this verſe in his Eſſay on Criticiſm,

(9) B. 1. 127. (1) Character of a ſmall Poet: ſeveral paſſages of which are very applicable to Mr. Pope. See alſo his character of an Imitater. (2). B. 4. 125.

Drink

Drink deep, or taſte not the Pierian ſpring.

From what *Drayton* ſaid of *Johnſon* (3).

Who had drunk deep of the Pierian ſpring.

But to haſten to a concluſion. It will be difficult to find in Hiſtory two literary characters that ſo nearly reſemble each other, as thoſe of *Pope* and of *Arruntius* mentioned by *Seneca* (4). The parallel will be eaſily diſcovered by inſpecting the original. The Roman was a cloſe copier of *Salluſt*'s diction. The Engliſhman in a very early preface tells us, That he ſerved himſelf all he could by his reading; and this cuſ-

(3) Elegies, Ed. 1627. p. 208.

(4) Arruntius, vir raræ frugalitatis, qui hiſtorias belli punici, ſcripſit, fuit Salluſtianus, & in illud genus nitens. Eſt apud Salluſtium *exercitum argento fecit*: id eſt pecunia paravit. Hoc Arruntius amare cæpit: poſuit illud omnibus paginis. Dicit quodam loco: *fugam noſtris fecere*. Alio loco, *hiero rex Syracuſanorum bellum facit*. Et alio loco: *que audita Panormitanos dedere Romanis fecere*. Guſtum tibi dare volui. Totus his contexitur liber. Quæ apud Salluſtium rara fuerunt, apud hunc crebra ſunt, & pene continua nec ſine cauſa, ille enim in hæc incidebat: at hic illa quærebat. Vides autem quid ſequatur, ubi alicui vitium pro exemplo eſt dixit Salluſtius: *aquis hye mantibus*. Arruntius in primo libro belli punici ait: *repente hyemavit tempeſtas*. Et alio loco, cum dicere vellet frigidum annum fuiſſe, ait: *totus hyemavit annus*. Et alio loco: *Inde ſexaginta onerarias, leves præter militem & neceſſarios nautarum hyemante aquilone miſit*. Non definit omnibus locis hoc verbum infulcire. Quodam loco Salluſtius dicit: *inter arma civilia æqui boni famas petit*. Arruptius non temperavit, quo minus primo ſtatim libro poneret: *ingentes eſſe famas de regulo*. Hæc ergo & hujuſmodi vitia, quæ alicui impreſſit imitatio, non ſunt judicia luxuriæ, nec animi corrupti. Propria enim eſſe debent, & ex ipſo nata, ex quibus tu æſtimes alicujus affectus, Ep. 114.

tom

tom was rivetted in him. What *Arruntius* did by *Salluſt*, *Pope* has done in a very particular manner by *Milton:* there is hardly one compoſition of his in which there is not a ſentence, line, or remarkable expreſſion adopted from him. Thus from—

And bring all Heaven before mine eyes—

Pope has—As *brings all* Brobdignag *before* your thought,
And bring all Paradiſe *before* your *eye* (5).

Sometimes he is ingenuous enough to acquaint his readers with his obligations, and ſometimes not: but inſtead of this puts them upon a wrong ſcent, and directs them to other writers, though it is unqueſtionable that he has it from him, as in this inſtance —

As under ſeas Alpheus' ſecret ſluice
Bears Piſa's off'rings to his Arethuſe (6).

Here in his notes he directs us to Moſchus, Idyll. 8. Virg. Ecl. 10, though it will not admit of a doubt that he had it from *Milton's*

Divine Alpheus, who by ſecret ſluſe
Stole under ſeas to meet his Arethuſe (7).

Here the ſingularity of the Rhime, joined to the known fact of his ſo frequently borrowing from him, unqueſtionably aſcertains the Theft. But *Pope's* uſe of *Milton* did not ſtop, in his own compoſitions

(5) Moral Eſſays, Ep. 4. 104, 148. (6) Dunciad, B. 2. 341. (7) Arcades.

he

he is continually bringing of him into his tranſlations too; and what is more extraordinary, he did this where the original gave him not the leaſt handle for ſuch Licentiouſneſs (8). But it is not the Province of this work to point out that rank which is due to Mr. *Pope* as a Poet: that will beſt be ſeen when that ſenſible Critic the Author of the Eſſay on his Writings and Genius, ſhall have completed his deſign, and have put the finiſhing ſtroke to one of the moſt candid pieces of criticiſm extant in our language.

(8) Compare Odyſſey xi. v. 414, 15. Od. xiii. v. 5. with the original, and Milton, B. 8. v. 1, & ſeq.

FINIS.

17 JY 60

Speedily will be PUBLISHED,

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON THE

LETTERS

ON

CHIVALRY and ROMANCE.

Digo, que ſabe poco de achaque de Caballeriâ.

CERVANTES.

ERRATA.

Page 28, Line 11, for *thet* read *that*.
p. 33, note 4, for 10, r. 17.
Ib. 2d Quotation, l. 4, for *deſigned* r. *deign'd*.
p. 37, l. 2, for *there is no other*, r. *there is another*.
p. 38, 2d Quotation, l. 2, dele the 2d *and*.
p. 30, l. 25, for *queſte* r. *queſti*.
p. 55, l. 13, 14, for *entirely* r. *eminently*.
p. 62, Quotation from Tibullus, l. 2, for *qui* r. *quit*.

17 JY 60

17 JY 60